Calendar No. 726

100TH CONGRESS
2d Session

SENATE

REPORT
100–381

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1989

JUNE 9 (legislative day, JUNE 8), 1988.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 4567]

The Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H.R. 4567) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1989, and for other purposes, reports the same to the Senate with various amendments and presents herewith information relative to the changes recommended:

AMOUNT IN NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY, FISCAL YEAR 1989

Amount of bill as passed by the House	$17,789,985,000
Budget estimates considered by House	18,144,547,000
Budget estimates considered by Senate	18,144,547,000
Amount of bill as reported to the Senate	17,956,901,000
The bill as reported to the Senate—	
Under the budget estimate, 1989	−187,646,000
Over the House-passed bill	+169,401,000

S183-2

CONTENTS

TITLE I

Page

Department of Defense—Civil: Department of the Army:
- Corps of Engineers—Civil:
  - Construction, general 23
  - Flood control and coastal emergencies 35
  - Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries 35
  - General expenses 56
  - General investigations 7
  - General regulatory functions 56
  - Operation and maintenance, general 39

TITLE II

Department of the Interior:
- Bureau of Reclamation:
  - Construction Program 62
  - Emergency fund 74
  - General administrative expenses 74
  - General investigations 58
  - Loan Program 72
  - Operation and maintenance 71
  - Working Capital Fund 75

TITLE III

Department of Energy:
- Atomic energy defense activities 149
- Basic research user facilities 141
- Departmental administration 188
- Energy supply, research and development activities 77
- Federal Energy Regulatory Commission 200
- General science and research activities 133
- Geothermal Resources Development Fund 202
- Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund 147
- Power marketing administrations:
  - Alaska Power Administration 196
  - Bonneville Power Administration 196
  - Southeastern Power Administration 198
  - Southwestern Power Administration 199
  - Western Area Power Administration 200
- Uranium supply and enrichment activities 127

TITLE IV

Independent Agencies:
- Appalachian Regional Commission 203
- Delaware River Basin Commission 204
- Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin 204
- Nuclear Regulatory Commission 205
- Susquehanna River Basin Commission 206
- Tennessee Valley Authority 206

PURPOSE

The purpose of this bill is to provide appropriations for the fiscal year 1989 beginning October 1, 1988, and ending September 30, 1989, for energy and water development, and for other related purposes. It supplies funds for water resources development programs and related activities of the Department of the Army, Civil Functions—U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' Civil Works Program in title I; for the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Reclamation in title II; for the Department of Energy's energy research activities (except for fossil fuel programs and certain conservation and regulatory functions), including atomic energy defense activities in title III; and for related independent agencies and commissions, including the Appalachian Regional Commission and Appalachian regional development programs, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and the Tennessee Valley Authority in title IV.

SUMMARY OF ESTIMATES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The fiscal year 1989 budget estimates for the bill total $18,144,547,000 in new budget (obligational) authority. The recommendation of the Committee totals $17,956,901,000. This is $187,646,000 below the budget estimates and $169,401,000 over the House bill.

BILL HIGHLIGHTS

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

The amount recommended in the bill includes $8,092,100,000 for atomic energy defense activities. Major programs and activities include:

Testing	$467,361,000
Research and development	978,882,000
Production and surveillance	2,243,228,000
Nuclear materials production	1,980,359,000
Defense waste management and environmental restoration	976,500,000
Nuclear directed energy weapons SDI	255,000,000

ENERGY SUPPLY, RESEARCH, AND DEVELOPMENT

The bill recommended by the Committee provides a total of $2,208,426,000 for energy supply, research, development and demonstration programs including:

Solar energy	$98,839,000
Biological and environmental research	264,000,000
Nuclear fission R&D	369,170,000
Magnetic fusion	356,000,000
Basic energy sciences	569,730,000

GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH

The Committee recommendation also provides a net appropriation of $934,616,000 for general science and research activities in life sciences, high energy physics, and nuclear physics. Major programs are:

High energy physics research	$656,806,000
Nuclear physics	274,600,000

REGULATORY AND OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

Also recommended in the bill is $559,861,000 for various regulatory and independent agencies of the Federal Government. Major programs include:

Appalachian Regional Commission	$110,700,000
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	108,760,000
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	430,000,000
Tennessee Valley Authority	103,000,000

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

The Committee has also recommended appropriations totaling approximately $4,259,668,000 for Federal water resource development programs. This includes projects and related activities of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers—Civil, the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior, and the Tennessee Valley Authority. The Federal Water Resource Development Program provides lasting benefits to the Nation in the area of flood control, municipal and industrial water supply, irrigation of agricultural lands, water conservation, commercial navigation, hydroelectric power, recreation, and fish and wildlife enhancement.

Water is our Nation's most precious and valuable resource. It is evident that water supply in the near future will be as important, if not more so, than energy. There is only so much water available. Water cannot be manufactured. Our Nation cannot survive without water, and economic prosperity cannot occur without a plentiful supply.

While many areas of the country suffer from severe shortages of water, others suffer from the other extreme—an excess of water which threatens both rural and urban areas with floods. Because water is a national asset, and because the availability and control of water affects and benefits all States and jurisdictions, the Federal Government has historically assumed much of the responsibility for financing of water resource development.

The existing national water resource infrastructure in America is an impressive system of dams, locks, harbors, canals, irrigation systems, reservoirs, and recreation sites with a central purpose—to serve the public's needs.

Our waterways and harbors are an essential part of our national transportation system—providing clean, efficient, and economical transportation of fuels for energy generation and agricultural production, and making possible residential and industrial development to provide homes and jobs for the American people.

Reservoir projects provide hydroelectric power production and downstream flood protection, make available recreational opportunities for millions of urban residents, enhance fish and wildlife habitat, and provide our communities and industries with abundant and clean water supplies which are essential not only to life itself, but also to help maintain a high standard of living for the American people.

When projects are completed, they make enormous contributions to America. The benefits derived from completed projects, in many instances, vastly exceed those contemplated during project development.

NEW CONSTRUCTION COMMITMENTS

In formulating the bill the Committee was faced with extremely limited budgetary resources for domestic discretionary programs. In light of these severe constraints, the Committee is compelled to recommend a policy of no new major construction commitments for fiscal year 1989. The decision on just how to achieve this year's budgetary targets was not easy, and was taken because the Committee did not want to unduly impact ongoing domestic projects and programs in order to obtain funding resources to undertake new construction commitments, particularly when existing facilities are underutilized or are not being adequately maintained at the present time.

Therefore, the Committee has not included funds for any new construction starts for the Corps of Engineers or the Bureau of Reclamation. In addition, no major new construction funding is included for the Department of Energy's domestic programs.

SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS

The Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development of the Committee on Appropriations held 10 sessions in connection with the fiscal year 1989 appropriation bill. One closed hearing session was held on classified matters related to atomic energy defense activities. Witnesses included officials and representatives of the Federal agencies, numerous Members of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, Governors, State and local officials and representatives, and hundreds of private citizens of all walks of life from throughout the United States. Testimony, both for and against many items, was presented to the subcommittee. The recommendations for fiscal year 1989, therefore, have been developed after careful consideration of available data.

VOTES IN THE COMMITTEE

The subcommittee, by unanimous vote of a quorum present on June 7, 1988, recommended that the bill, as amended, be reported to the full Committee on Appropriations.

The Committee, by unanimous vote of a quorum present on June 9, 1988, recommended that the bill, as amended be reported to the Senate.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

GENERAL COMMENTS

The Committee received testimony this year from numerous witnesses regarding the cost-sharing provisions contained in the Water Resources Development Act of 1986. Many requests were made to change or waive the cost-sharing requirements on several projects. However, most disturbing were the comments that the Assistant Secretary of the Army and the Corps of Engineers were not being responsive to the flood protection needs of many communities across the country in areas where economic and other circumstances limited local governments ability to share the costs of a federally authorized project.

An example of this was provided by the mayor of West Memphis, AR, who traced that community's recent history of damage and death due to floods and other natural disasters. The mayor's testimony contained a quote from the Federal Emergency Management Agency [FEMA] regarding the city's ability to share the costs for protection. FEMA stated: "Due to the lower per capita income level in the area, and as a result of the effect of the flood and tornadoes on a large percentage of the population, the capability of the local officials to generate additional local revenues for matching funds required under Public Law 99–662 has been eliminated. For example, 80 percent of the disaster victims have not been able to qualify for Small Business Administration [SBA] loans."

The Committee is concerned with the way the Assistant Secretary of the Army has proceeded in formulating guidelines and regulations to establish special ability to pay provisions under section 103(m) of Public Law 99–662. Continued delay and uncertainty has created problems at the local level in responding to the flood control needs of many communities. More important, however, is that the uncertain policy has increased the pressure to simply exempt projects from cost-sharing requirements.

While concern exist with the handling of section 103(m), the Committee is committed to following the provisions of Public Law 99–662 as enacted. However, fairness and equity dictate that all regions and communities be able to participate in the benefits to be derived from Federal water resource programs. Therefore, the Committee expects and directs the Assistant Secretary of the Army and the Corps of Engineers to aggressively move to finalize the rules and regulations under the

ability to pay section of Public Law 99–662, and to send forward to the Congress those projects which qualify under those guidelines.

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriations, 1988	$138,767,000
Budget estimate, 1989	129,271,000
House allowance	142,405,000
Committee recommendation	140,411,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+11,140,000
House allowance	−1,994,000

An appropriation of $140,411,000 is recommended by the Committee, which is $1,994,000 below the House and $11,140,000 above the budget request.

The recommended amounts provided under this account for surveys and planning activities are shown in the following table, with Committee comments following immediately after the tabulation.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		HOUSE ALLOWANCE		SENATE ALLOWANCE	
		INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
	ALABAMA						
(N)	BAYOU LA BATRE, AL	---	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000
(FDP)	VALLEY CREEK, WARRIOR RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, AL	190,000	---	190,000	---	190,000	---
	ALASKA						
(FC)	HOMER SPIT STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION, AK	---	130,000	---	130,000	---	130,000
(N)	KODIAK HARBOR, AK	---	475,000	---	475,000	---	475,000
(FDP)	RIVERS & HARBORS , AK	963,000	---	963,000	---	963,000	---
(FDP)	STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION; UNALASKA, AK	144,000	---	144,000	---	144,000	---
	ARIZONA						
(RCP)	ALAMO LAKE, AZ	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FC)	CLIFTON, AZ	---	450,000	---	450,000	---	450,000
(FWP)	SANTA CRUZ RIVER	---	---	---	---	200,000	---
(FC)	HOLBROOK, AZ	---	220,000	---	220,000	---	220,000
(FDP)	NAVAJO INDIAN RESERVATION, AZ	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---
(FC)	NOGALES WASH, AZ	---	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000
(FC)	OLD CROSS CUT CANAL, AZ	---	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000
(FC)	RILLITO, AZ	---	290,000	---	290,000	---	290,000
(FDP)	GILA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, AZ	---	---	500,000	---	500,000	---
	ARKANSAS						
(FDP)	ARKANSAS RIVER BASIN, AR & OK	430,000	---	430,000	---	430,000	---
(MP)	BEAVER LAKE, AR	---	---	---	1,000,000	---	---
(FDP)	BELL FOLEY LAKE, AR	---	---	---	25,000	---	---
(FC)	CANE CREEK BRIDGE REPLACEMENT	---	---	---	100,000	---	---
(FDP)	CENTRAL ARKANSAS STUDY, AR	600,000	---	600,000	---	600,000	---
(COM)	OUACHITA RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE	---	---	---	---	350,000	---
	VILLAGE CREEK, JACKSON AND LAWRENCE COUNTIES, AR	---	---	---	10,000	---	---
	WHITE RIVER FISH HATCHERY, AR	---	---	100,000	---	---	---
	AMERICAN SAMOA						
(COM)	TERRITORIES DEVELOPMENT STUDY, AS	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---
	CALIFORNIA						
(FC)	CACHE CREEK BASIN (OUTLET CHANNEL), CA	---	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000
(FC)	CACHE CREEK SETTLING BASIN, CA	---	---	---	400,000	---	400,000
(FC)	CALIENTE CREEK, CA	---	1,200,000	---	1,200,000	---	1,000,000
(SPE)	COAST OF CALIFORNIA, STORM AND TIDAL WAVES, CA	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---
(FC)	COYOTE & BERRYESSA CREEKS, CA	---	800,000	---	800,000	---	800,000
(FC)	DRY CREEK, ROSEVILLE, CA	---	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000
(FC)	GUADALUPE RIVER, CA	---	611,000	---	611,000	---	611,000
(N)	HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY (DEEPENING), CA	350,000	---	350,000	---	350,000	---
(FDP)	IMPERIAL AND SAN DIEGO COUNTY STREAMS - SALTON SEA, CA	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(N)	LOS ANGELES - LONG BEACH HARBORS, CA	49,000	---	---	299,000	49,000	---

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		HOUSE ALLOWANCE		SENATE ALLOWANCE	
		INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
(FDP)	LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA REVIEW, CA	592,000	---	592,000	---	592,000	---
(FDP)	MARIN COUNTY SHORELINE, CA-SAN RAFAEL CANAL	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
(N)	MORRO BAY HARBOR, CA	220,000	---	220,000	---	220,000	---
(FC)	NAPA RIVER, CA	---	550,000	---	550,000	---	550,000
(FDP)	NORTHERN CALIFORNIA STREAMS, AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED,	600,000	---	600,000	---	600,000	---
(FDP)	NORTHERN CALIFORNIA STREAMS, SACRAMENTO METRO AREA, CA	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(N)	NOYO RIVER AND HARBOR (BREAKWATER), CA	---	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000
(N)	OCEANSIDE HARBOR, CA	---	240,000	---	240,000	---	240,000
(FDP)	PINE FLAT DAM, KINGS RIVER, CA	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
(N)	REDONDO BEACH (KING HARBOR), CA	---	250,000	---	500,000	---	500,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER FLOOD CONTROL	---	---	---	360,000	---	360,000
(FDP)	SACRAMENTO-SAN JOAQUIN DELTA, CA	230,000	---	230,000	---	230,000	---
(FDP)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY SHORELINE, CA	222,000	---	222,000	---	222,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, CALAVERAS RIVER, CA	450,000	---	450,000	---	450,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, KAWEAH RIVER, CA	350,000	---	350,000	---	350,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, TULE RIVER, CA	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	SAN LORENZO RIVER, CA	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN AND ORANGE COUNTY, CA	616,000	---	616,000	---	616,000	---
(FC)	SANTA ANA RIVER MAINSTEM, CA	---	---	---	6,150,000	---	6,150,000
(SP)	SANTA BARBARA COUNTY (BEACH EROSION), CA	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(RDP)	SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA	130,000	---	130,000	---	130,000	---
(SP)	SANTA MONICA BREAKWATER, CA	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(N)	SUNSET HARBOR-BOLSA CHICA	---	---	350,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	UPPER GUADALUPE RIVER, CA	480,000	---	480,000	---	480,000	---
(N)	VENTURA HARBOR, CA.	---	---	---	100,000	---	---
(FDP)	WALNUT CREEK BASIN, CA	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	YUBA RIVER CA	---	---	200,000	---	500,000	---
	COLORADO						
(FDP)	BOX ELDER CREEK BASIN, CO	---	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	COLORADO SPRINGS, FOUNTAIN CREEK, CO	50,000	---	50,000	---	50,000	---
	CONNECTICUT						
(N)	HOCKANUM RIVER, CT	---	---	50,000	---	---	---
(COM)	WEST CENTRAL CONNECTICUT COASTAL FLOODING, CT	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
	DELAWARE						
	CHESAPEAKE & DELAWARE CANAL PROJECT DEEPENING, DE & MD	---	---	750,000	---	---	---
	DIST OF COLUMBIA						
(N)	WASHINGTON, DC & VICINITY	---	470,000	---	470,000	---	470,000
	FLORIDA						
(N)	BISCAYNE BAY, FL	---	---	300,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	BROWARD COUNTY, FL	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(N)	BROWARD COUNTY, HILLSBORO INLET, FL	---	---	---	100,000	---	---

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		HOUSE ALLOWANCE		SENATE ALLOWANCE	
		INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
(N)	CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL	59,000	---	59,000	---	59,000	---
(N)	CLEARWATER SPOIL DISPOSAL, FL	---	---	150,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	COAST OF FLORIDA EROSION AND STORM EFFECTS STUDY, FL	750,000	---	750,000	---	750,000	---
(SP)	FORT DESOTO, FL	---	---	100,000	---	---	---
(N)	FORT PIERCE HARBOR, FL	---	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000
(N)	HUDSON RIVER, FL	---	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000
(N)	MIAMI HARBOR CHANNEL, FL	---	700,000	---	700,000	---	700,000
(N)	MIAMI HARBOR CLEANUP, FL	---	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000
(BE)	MONROE COUNTY, FL	---	---	---	200,000	---	200,000
(NS)	NORTHWEST FLORIDA WATER SUPPLY	---	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(N)	PALM VALLEY BRIDGE, FL	---	---	75,000	---	---	---
(BE)	PANAMA CITY BEACHES, FL	---	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000
(N)	PORT EVERGLADES HARBOR, FL	50,000	---	50,000	---	50,000	---
(BE)	SARASOTA COUNTY, FL	---	175,000	---	175,000	---	175,000
(BE)	ST JOHNS COUNTY, FL	---	70,000	---	70,000	---	70,000
(FDP)	ST MARYS RIVER BASIN, FL & GA	---	---	125,000	---	---	---
	ST PETERSBURG PORT, FL	---	---	140,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	ST PETERSBURG AND VICINITY, FL	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	SUWANNEE RIVER, FL	257,000	---	257,000	---	257,000	---
(N)	TAMPA BAY (PORT SUTTON), FL	---	125,000	---	125,000	---	125,000
(SP)	VIRGINIA KEY BARRIER ISLAND PARK	---	---	50,000	---	---	---
(SP)	WATSON ISLAND PARK BEACH EROSION	---	---	50,000	---	---	---
	GEORGIA						
(N)	SAVANNAH HARBOR COMPREHENSIVE, GA	---	---	100,000	---	---	---
(N)	SAVANNAH HARBOR EXTENSION, GA	---	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	SAVANNAH RIVER BASIN, GA, SC & NC	210,000	---	210,000	---	210,000	---
	UMPRELLA CREEK, GA	---	---	50,000	---	---	---
	HAWAII						
(FC)	ALENAIO STREAM, HI	---	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000
(N)	KAWAIHAE SMALL BOAT HARBOR, HI	---	157,000	---	157,000	---	157,000
(N)	MAALAEA HARBOR, MAUI, HI	---	210,000	---	210,000	---	210,000
	IDAHO						
(FDP)	COLUMBIA RIVER & TRIBS, ID, MT, OR&WA	904,000	---	904,000	---	904,000	---
(RDP)	MUD LAKE, ID	125,000	---	125,000	---	125,000	---
(FDP)	PALOUSE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, ID & WA	125,000	---	125,000	---	125,000	---
(FDP)	UPPER SNAKE RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, ID & WY	558,000	---	558,000	---	558,000	---
	ILLINOIS						
(FDP)	ALEXANDER AND PULASKI COUNTIES, IL	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	DES PLAINES RIVER, IL	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(N)	LOCKS AND DAMS 52 AND 53, IL & KY (OLMSTED)	---	2,500,000	---	3,750,000	---	3,750,000
(FC)	LOVES PARK, IL	---	209,000	---	209,000	---	209,000
(FC)	MCCOOK AND THORNTON RESERVOIRS (CUP),IL	---	1,425,000	---	1,425,000	---	1,425,000
(FC)	O'HARE RESERVOIR, IL	---	365,000	---	365,000	---	365,000
(FDP)	WEST FRANKFORT AND VICINITY, IL	125,000	---	125,000	---	125,000	---

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET ESTIMATES PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING	SENATE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	SENATE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
	INDIANA						
(FC)	FORT WAYNE METROPOLITAN AREA, IN	---	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000
(FC)	LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, IN	---	240,000	---	240,000	---	240,000
(FDP)	ST. JOSEPH RIVER BASIN, IN & MI	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
	IOWA						
(RCP)	MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM RE-EVALUATION, IA, NE, MO.	50,000	---	50,000	---	50,000	---
(FC)	MUSCATINE ISLAND LEVEE & DRAINAGE DISTRICT, IA	---	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000
(FC)	PERRY CREEK, IA	---	187,000	---	187,000	---	187,000
(FDP)	THURMAN TO HAMBURG, IA	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FC)	THURMAN TO HAMBURG PUMPING FACILITIES, IA	---	---	---	100,000	---	---
(FC)	WEST DES MOINES-DES MOINES,IA	---	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000
	KANSAS						
(FC)	ARKANSAS CITY	---	---	---	---	---	200,000
(FDP)	ARK RIVER AND TRIBS, GREAT BEND, KS TO TULSA, OK (REMA	400,000	---	650,000	---	400,000	---
(FDP)	CANEY RIV, KS & OK	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
(FC)	DOUGLASS LAKE, KS	---	750,000	---	750,000	---	750,000
(FDP)	NEOSHO RIVER ABOVE JOHN REDMOND DAM, KS	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FDP)	TURKEY CREEK BASIN, KS & MO	170,000	---	170,000	---	170,000	---
(FC)	UPPER LITTLE ARKANSAS RIVER WATERSHED, KS	---	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000
	KENTUCKY						
(N)	CUMBERLAND-TENNESSEE RIVERS, KY, GA, AL, MS, NC, TN &.	1,050,000	---	1,050,000	---	1,050,000	---
(FC)	FRANKFORT (SOUTH FRANKFORT), KY	---	175,000	---	175,000	---	175,000
(FDP)	GREEN & BARREN RIVERS, KY	---	---	800,000	---	400,000	---
(FDP)	KENTUCKY RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, KY (STATION CAMP CK INTE	180,000	---	180,000	---	180,000	---
(FDP)	LICKING RIVER BASIN STUDY	---	---	---	---	400,000	---
	LOUISVILLE WATERFRONT PARK, KY	---	---	---	650,000	---	---
(FDP)	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, KY	600,000	---	600,000	---	600,000	---
(FDP)	OHIO RIVER MAIN STEM, KY, IL, IN, OH, PA, & WV	1,660,000	---	1,660,000	---	1,460,000	---
	TAYLORSVILLE LAKE, KY -FLYODS FORK BRIDGE REPLACEMENT.	---	---	---	60,000	---	---

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		HOUSE ALLOWANCE		SENATE ALLOWANCE	
		INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
	LOUISIANA						
(FDP)	ALOHA-RIGOLETTE, LA	---	---	---	250,000	---	250,000
(FDP)	AMITE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, LA	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(N)	BAYOU LAFOURCHE AND LAFOURCHE - JUMP WATERWAY, LA	85,000	---	85,000	---	85,000	---
(N)	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, LA & TX SECTION	210,000	---	210,000	---	210,000	---
(FDP)	LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA, LA-COMPREHENSIVE COASTAL PLAN.	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FDP)	LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA, LA - HURRICANE PROTECTION	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA, LA-LAND LOSS & MARSH CREATION.	170,000	---	223,000	---	223,000	---
(FDP)	LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA, LA-MISSISSIPPI RIVER DELTA	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA, LA-SHORE & BARRIER ISLAND	225,000	---	245,000	---	245,000	---
(FDP)	MERM, VERM & CALC RIVERS & BY TECHE, LA	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---
(N)	MR-GO BANK EROSION, LA	81,000	---	81,000	---	81,000	---
(COM)	RED RIVER BASIN, AR AND LA, COMPREHENSIVE STUDY	450,000	---	450,000	---	450,000	---
(N)	RED RIVER WATERWAY-SHREVEPORT, LA TODAINGERFIELD, TX	---	---	---	100,000	---	100,000
(N)	RED RIVER WATERWAY,SHREVEPORT, LA, TO INDEX, ARK	---	---	---	---	---	250,000
(FDP)	UPPER BAYOU TECHE, LA	82,000	---	82,000	---	82,000	---
(FDP)	VERMILION RIVER & BAYOU TIGRE	265,000	---	265,000	---	265,000	---
(FDP)	WEST BANK OF THE MISS. R. IN THE VICINITY OF NEW ORLEA	450,000	---	450,000	---	450,000	---
(FC)	WESTWEGO TO HARVEY CANAL, LA	---	600,000	---	600,000	---	600,000

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		HOUSE ALLOWANCE		SENATE ALLOWANCE	
		INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
	MAINE						
(FDP)	ANDROSCOGGIN RIVER, ME & NH	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	KENNEBEC RIVER, ME	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FDP)	PENOBSCOT RIVER, ME	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FDP)	SACO RIVER, ME & NH	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
	MARYLAND						
(BE)	ATLANTIC COAST OF MD AND ASSATEAGUE ISLAND, VA	---	709,000	---	709,000	---	709,000
(SP)	CHESAPEAKE BAY (SHORELINE EROSION), MD & VA	415,000	---	415,000	---	415,000	---
(SPE)	CHESAPEAKE BAY TIME VARIABLE MODEL, MD, VA, PA & DC	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	CHESAPEAKE BAY & TRIBUTARIES REALLOCATION, MD, PA, VA	225,000	---	225,000	---	225,000	---
	MASSACHUSETTS						
(FC)	BROCKTON, MA	---	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000
(SP)	COASTAL BREACH AT NAUSET BEACH, CHATHAM, MA	220,000	---	220,000	---	220,000	---
(FC)	MASSACHUSETTS COASTAL, ROUGHANS POINT, REVERE, MA	---	295,000	---	295,000	---	295,000
(COM)	SOUTHEASTERN NEW ENGLAND AUTH. REPORTS, MA, RI & CT	355,000	---	355,000	---	355,000	---
	SPICKET RIVER, MA & NH	---	---	250,000	---	---	---
	MICHIGAN						
	MONROE HARBOR, MI	---	---	---	400,000	---	---
(FDP)	SAGINAW RIVER, MI	464,000	---	464,000	---	464,000	---
(FDP)	SOUTHERN WAYNE COUNTY, MI	130,000	---	130,000	---	130,000	---
	MINNESOTA						
	CROOKSTON, MN	---	---	400,000	---	---	---
(N)	DULUTH - SUPERIOR HARBOR, MN & WI	---	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000
(FDP)	MINNESOTA RIVER VALLEY, MN	139,000	---	139,000	---	139,000	---
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER AT ST. PAUL, MN	---	350,000	---	350,000	---	350,000
(FDP)	RAINY RIVER BASIN, MN	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FC)	ROOT RIVER AT HOUSTON, MN	---	260,000	---	260,000	---	260,000
	SKY HARBOR MUNICIPAL AIRPORT, DULUTH, MN	---	---	---	50,000	---	---
(RDP)	WAHPETON, ND - BRECKENRIDGE, MN	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
	MISSISSIPPI						
(N)	ESCATAWPA RIVER, JACKSON COUNTY, MS	173,000	---	173,000	---	173,000	---
(N)	GULFPORT HARBOR, MS	---	231,000	---	231,000	---	231,000
(FDP)	LOWER PEARL RIVER BASIN, FLOW DISTRIBUTION, MS & LA	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	MISSISSIPPI GULF COASTAL AREAS, MS	45,000	---	45,000	---	45,000	---
(N)	PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS	---	260,000	---	260,000	---	260,000
(FDP)	PEARL RIVER BASIN, MS & LA	122,000	---	122,000	---	122,000	---
(FC)	PEARL RIVER, SHOCCOE DAM, MS	---	600,000	---	600,000	---	600,000
(FDP)	TOMBIGBEE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MS & AL	500,000	---	500,000	---	500,000	---

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		HOUSE ALLOWANCE		SENATE ALLOWANCE	
		INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
	MISSOURI						
	BIRD'S POINT-NEW MADRID FLOODWAY, MO	---	---	500,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	BLUE RIVER BASIN, KANSAS CITY, MO	145,000	---	145,000	---	145,000	---
(FC)	BRUSH CREEK, KANSAS CITY, MO	---	390,000	---	390,000	---	390,000
(FC)	CAPE GIRARDEAU - JACKSON METRO AREA, MO	---	600,000	---	600,000	---	600,000
(FDP)	GRAND RIVER BASIN, MO & IA	80,000	---	80,000	---	80,000	---
(FC)	MALINE CREEK, MO	---	600,000	---	600,000	---	600,000
(FC)	RIVER DES PERES, MO	---	---	---	500,000	---	400,000
(FC)	STE. GENEVIEVE, MO	---	---	---	200,000	---	---
(FDP)	ST. JOSEPH, MO AND VICINITY	160,000	---	160,000	---	160,000	---
(N)	ST. LOUIS HARBOR, MO & ILL	---	---	---	---	100,000	---
	NEBRASKA						
(FDP)	ANTELOPE CREEK, LINCOLN, NE	120,000	---	120,000	---	120,000	---
(FC)	PLATTE RIVER BANK STABILIZATION DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.	---	---	---	100,000	---	100,000
(FDP)	RALSTON AND LEYDEN CREEKS, CO	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	WOOD RIVER, GRAND ISLAND, NE	160,000	---	160,000	---	160,000	---
	NEVADA						
(FDP)	LAS VEGAS WASH AND TRIBUTARIES, NV	160,000	---	160,000	---	160,000	---
(FC)	TRUCKEE MEADOWS, NV	---	1,600,000	---	1,600,000	---	1,600,000
	NEW HAMPSHIRE						
(FDP)	ASHUELOT RIVER, NH	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	MASCOMA RIVER, NH	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
	NEW JERSEY						
(N)	ARTHUR KILL EXTENSION, HOWLAND HOOK TO CARTERET, NJ &.	175,000	---	475,000	---	475,000	---
(FDP)	BEATTIES DAM, NJ	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER COMPREHENSIVE NAVIGATION STUDY, NJ, PA.	316,000	---	316,000	---	316,000	---
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER, VICINITY OF CAMDEN, BECKETT ST TERMINA	---	30,000	---	30,000	---	30,000
(BE)	GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET AND PECK BEACH, NJ	---	---	---	50,000	---	---
(FDP)	HACKENSACK RIVER BASIN, NJ & NY	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---
(FC)	LOWER SADDLE RIVER, NJ	---	750,000	---	750,000	---	750,000
(FC)	MOLLY ANN'S BROOK, NJ	---	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000
(SP)	NEW JERSEY COASTAL EROSION AND STORM EFFECTS	---	---	---	---	500,000	---
(N)	NEW JERSEY IWW, SHREWSBURY RIVER TO DELAWARE BAY, NJ..	125,000	---	125,000	---	125,000	---
(N)	NEW YORK HBR & ADJ CHANNELS, PORT JERSEY, NJ	---	500,000	---	500,000	---	500,000
(SP)	PASSAIC RIVER EAST BANK STABILIZATION, NJ	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FC)	PASSAIC RIVER MAINSTEM, NJ	---	750,000	---	750,000	---	750,000
(FC)	PINE BROOK, MANALAPAN TWP, NJ	---	75,000	---	75,000	---	75,000
(FDP)	POPLAR BROOK, NJ	50,000	---	50,000	---	50,000	---
(FC)	RAMAPO RIVER AT OAKLAND, NJ	---	470,000	---	470,000	---	470,000
(FC)	RAMAPO AND MAHWAH RIVERS AT MAHWAH, NJ & SUFFERN, NY..	---	---	---	25,000	---	25,000
(FC)	RARITAN RIVER BASIN, GREEN BROOK SUB-BASIN, NJ	---	1,500,000	---	1,500,000	---	1,500,000

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		HOUSE ALLOWANCE		SENATE ALLOWANCE	
		INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
	NEW MEXICO						
(FC)	ABIQUIU DAM (EMERGENCY GATES), NM	---	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000
(FDP)	ROSWELL, PECOS RIVER, NM	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FDP)	CARLSBAD, PECOS RIVER, NM	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	RIO GRANDE AND TRIBUTARIES, NM & CO	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	RIO GRANDE BASIN-REEVALUATION OF OPERATION PLANS, CO,N	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FC)	RIO GRANDE FLOODWAY, SAN ACACIA TO BOSQUE DEL APACHE,	---	450,000	---	450,000	---	450,000
	NEW YORK						
(BE)	ATLANTIC COAST OF NEW YORK CITY (CONEY ISLAND), NY	---	600,000	---	600,000	---	600,000
(FDP)	BUFFALO METRO AREA, NY	277,000	---	277,000	---	277,000	---
(N)	GOWANUS CREEK CHANNEL, NY	---	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000
(N)	HUDSON RIVER CHANNEL, PORT OF NEW YORK TO ALBANY, N.Y.	---	---	---	---	400,000	---
(SP)	LONG BEACH ISLAND, NY	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	MOOSE AND BLACK RIVERS, NY	190,000	---	190,000	---	190,000	---
(N)	OLCOTT HARBOR, NY	---	350,000	---	350,000	---	350,000
(FC)	WESTCHESTER CO STREAMS, MAMARONECK & SHELDRAKE RIVERS,	---	90,000	---	90,000	---	90,000
(FC)	WESTCHESTER CO STREAMS, TOWN OF MAMARONECK, NY	---	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000
	NORTH CAROLINA						
(FC)	BRUNSWICK COUNTY, NC	---	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000
(FDP)	EASTERN NORTH CAROLINA ABOVE CAPE LOOKOUT, NC	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
(N)	MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR, NC	120,000	---	120,000	---	120,000	---
(FDP)	NEUSE RIVER, NC	448,000	---	448,000	---	448,000	---
(N)	WILMINGTON HARBOR - NORTHEAST (CAPE FEAR) RIVER, NC	---	175,000	---	175,000	---	175,000
	NORTH DAKOTA						
(FC)	SHEYENNE RIVER, WEST FARGO AND RIVERSIDE, ND	---	---	---	880,000	---	880,000

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		HOUSE ALLOWANCE		SENATE ALLOWANCE	
		INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
	OHIO						
(FDP)	CENTRAL OHIO SURVEY (GRANDVIEW HEIGHTS INTERIM), OH...	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FC)	FAIRFIELD, OH.....	---	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000
(N)	LAKE ERIE-OHIO RIVER CANAL, OH & PA.....	---	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---
(FC)	LOGAN, OH.....	---	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000
(H)	LORAIN HARBOR, OH.....	---	136,000	---	136,000	---	136,000
(FDP)	METROPOLITAN REGION OF CINCINNATI, OH, KY, IN.....	50,000	---	50,000	---	50,000	---
(FC)	NELSONVILLE, OH.....	---	355,000	---	355,000	---	355,000
(FC)	NORTH CHILLICOTHE, SCIOTO RIVER, OH.....	---	600,000	---	600,000	---	600,000
(FDP)	SANDUSKY RIVER, OH.....	267,000	---	267,000	---	267,000	---
(FC)	WEST COLUMBUS, OH.....	---	---	---	200,000	---	200,000
	WEST FORK OF MILL CREEK LAKE, OH -SECTION 1135	---	---	---	500,000	---	500,000
	OKLAHOMA						
(COM)	ARK RIV & TRIBS, SC&SE AREAS OF OK-COMPREHENSIVE STUDY	---	---	400,000	---	---	---
(MP)	BROKEN BOW, OK.....	---	---	---	200,000	---	---
(FDP)	CRUTCHO CREEK, CANADIAN R. & TRIBS, OK, TX, NM.....	---	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FC)	FRY CREEKS, BIXBY, OK.....	---	500,000	---	500,000	---	500,000
(FDP)	KEYSTONE DAM TO TULSA, ARKANSAS RIVER, OK.....	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
(RDP)	LUKFATA LAKE, OK (HYDROPOWER STUDY).....	---	---	50,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	MIAMI, OK & VICINITY.....	50,000	---	50,000	---	50,000	---
(FDP)	NORTH CANADIAN RIVER ABOVE LAKE OVERHOLSER, OK.....	125,000	---	125,000	---	125,000	---
(COM)	RED RIVER BASIN, OK, AR, LA & TX (COMPREHENSIVE STUDY)	---	---	250,000	---	---	---
	OREGON						
(N)	COOS BAY, OR (DEEP DRAFT NAVIGATION).....	80,000	---	80,000	---	80,000	---
(COM)	WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN,OR.....	328,000	---	328,000	---	328,000	---
	PENNSYLVANIA						
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA TO TRENTON, SECTION 201, TIOGA MARINA TERMINAL.....	---	---	---	---	---	100,000
(FDP)	LACKAWANNA RIVER, PA.....	425,000	---	425,000	---	425,000	---
(FC)	LOCK HAVEN, PA.....	---	---	---	520,000	---	520,000
(FDP)	MONONGAHELA-YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER BASIN, MD, PA & WV.....	600,000	---	600,000	---	600,000	---
(FC)	PROMPTON LAKE, PA (MOD).....	---	1,000,000	---	---	---	---
(FC)	SAW MILL RUN, PITTSBURGH, PA.....	---	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000
(FC)	SCHUYLKILL RIVER BASIN, PA.....	---	---	100,000	---	---	---
(FC)	SUSQUEHANNA BASIN AT HARRISBURG, PA.....	---	540,000	---	540,000	---	540,000
(FC)	WYOMING VALLEY LEVEE RAISING, PA.....	---	1,550,000	---	1,550,000	---	1,550,000

Gila rivers and tributaries, AZ.—The Committee has included $500,000 in the bill for the Gila River and tributaries study and directs the Corps of Engineers to proceed with reconnaissance level planning studies along the Salt and Gila Rivers through the Phoenix, AZ, metropolitan region from Granite Reef Dam to Gillespie Dam. The study will address a number of water-related issues and problems including flooding, landfills, hazardous waste sites, high ground water table, water supply and quality, transportation, open space, and recreation. This work should be carried out to better manage and control current and future problems in the flood plain. The 12-month reconnaissance study is to be initiated in fiscal year 1989 and is expected to cost no more than $500,000.

Red River Waterway, Shreveport, LA, to Index, AR.—The Committee has included $250,000 for the Red River Waterway, Shreveport, LA, to Index, AR, to continue preconstruction engineering and design on the Red River Waterway between Shreveport, LA, and Index, AR. The Committee is aware that the Corps is currently reviewing the project economic and benefit analysis to take into account recent sedimentation experience on the Red River Waterway, Mississippi River to Shreveport, navigation project and the fact that construction of the Shreveport to Index reach will result in reduction of sedimentation downstream. The Committee believes that reanalysis of the project economics will demonstrate that the project is a sound economic investment for the Nation and has included funds to carry out this review.

Licking River Basin, KY.—The Committee recommendation includes $400,000 for the Corps to study the water resource problems in the Licking River Basin in Kentucky. The Corps is to update its flood damage assessment and to estimate the projected economic growth of the area and future water needs so that the river communities can better improve their quality of life and have a balance between too much and too little water.

Louisiana coastal area studies.—The Committee has provided the full capability of the Corps of Engineers to continue ongoing wetland, marsh, and environmental studies of the coastal sections of Louisiana. The Corps is directed to fully utilize these funds and take other appropriate measures to expedite the completion of these important studies.

Bird's Point New Madrid Floodway, MO.—The House Committee in action on the bill included $500,000 for the Bird's Point-New Madrid Floodway study under the "General investigations" account. The Committee recommendation for this study has been included under the "Mississippi River and tributaries" account where it more properly belongs.

Hudson River, Port of New York to Albany, NY.—An amount of $400,000 has been included in the bill for the Corps of Engineers to conduct a feasibility study of selectively dredging the Hudson River from the Port of New York to Albany, NY, to a depth of 35 feet to provide greater access to points along the Hudson River.

River Des Peres, MO.—The Committee is aware that flash flooding and streambank erosion have been a major problem throughout the River Des Peres watershed since the 1950's and understands that the Corps of Engineers has recommended a plan to address the problems. In view of the serious history and nature of the needs, the Committee has included $400,000 in the bill for the Corps to conduct continued engineering and design on the River Des Peres project.

West Fork of Mill Creek Lake, OH.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for the West Fork of Mill Creek Lake, OH, under section 1135 authority. The Committee understands that the integrity of the 35-year-old lake, constructed by the Corps, is diminishing rapidly, that more than one-half of the lake's original water volume is filled with sediment, and that the project's flood control capability is in question. The funds have been provided in order that the lake may be restored as recommended by the Corps.

Big Sioux River, Sioux Falls, SD.—The Committee recommendation includes $322,000 for the Corps of Engineers to conduct a feasibility study to correct deficiencies in the design of the Big Sioux River flood control project in the vicinity of Sioux Falls, SD. The Committee is aware that the Corps recently advised the city of Sioux Falls that the original 1965 flood control project does not provide the needed level of protection and requires further study.

New Jersey erosion and storm effects comprehensive study.—The Committee has included $500,000 for the New Jersey erosion and storm effects study. The study will address the adverse impacts resulting from pollution and storm damage along the New Jersey coastline. The Corps of Engineers is directed to initiate the study without delay.

Corps of Engineers Technology Transfer Center.—The Committee does not concur with the House regarding the establishment of a technology transfer center.

Coordination studies with other agencies, States, and other non-Federal interests.—An amount of $9,505,000 is recommended for coordination studies with other agencies, States, and other non-Federal interests. This is an increase of $1,050,000 over the amount provided by the House.

The Committee received requests to increase the funding level up to the maximum of $300,000 from seven States. Since the enactment of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986, the importance and value of this program has become evident. As more and more States assume the planning role once carried out by the Federal Government, they are increasingly seeking technical assistance from the Corps of Engineers under this authority.

Due to limited budgetary resources, the Committee has been able to provide only a portion of the amount requested. The increase provided by the Committee over the House amount allows for an increase of $150,000 over that budgeted for each of the following States: Colorado, Minnesota, Nebraska, New Jersey, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Virginia. Finally, the Committee expects budgetary pressures to have a greater impact on this program in future years.

White River and tributaries, AR.—The Committee notes that funds were provided in 1988 to initiate a study of the impacts of navigation and recreation on the White River and its tributaries in Arkansas in order to maintain sufficient water levels to sustain optimum use of the river and its tributaries for navigation and other purposes. The Committee supports this effort and urges the Corps to complete this work in fiscal year 1989 using funds previously provided.

Sacramento River flood control project, CA.—The Committee has been informed that a series of flood flows have degraded the Sacramento River between river mile 202 and 206, and that this degradation has severely diminished the effectiveness of public facilities and assets associated with the irrigation intake works of the Glenn Coulsa Irrigation District. In the past, these problems have forced the Corps of Engineers to delay a 404 permit for the dredging of the District's intake channel from the river, thus threatening the economic viability of the District and indirectly a sizable region of California. Recently the Corps has granted the District a limited stow-year dredging permit. However, reneval of the permit has been made contingent on a multifaceted program to restore the facility to full effectiveness, with one element of the program being flood control work in the Sacramento River to compensate for the flood damage.

The Committee, therefore, directs that the Corps perform preconstruction engineering and design on a solution to restore hydraulic conditions in the river sufficient to enable the other elements of the 404 program to be fully successful. $360,000 has been provided for this purpose in fiscal year 1989 on the condition that local sponsors contribute another $120,000 toward the cost of the work.

Frazzle ice research, ID.—The Corps is directed to use up to $500,000, if conditions warrant, of available funds to carry out on-site studies relating to frazzle ice buildup in the Dump Creek area near Salmon, ID.

Souris River Basin, ND, (Rafferty and Alameda Dams, Saskatchewan, Canada).—Within the amount provided for the Souris River Basin, ND, project, the Secretary of the Army is directed to use $200,000 to conduct a study in participation with the State of North Dakota and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, to determine and recommend alternative plans to augment the flows in the Souris River, ND. This study is necessary to supplement flows in the United States for municipal, industrial, agricultural, and fish and wildlife purposes on this river, which has a shared apportionment between the United States and Canada.

STREAMLINED PLANNING AND APPROVAL PROCEDURES

The Committee is concerned that the new procedures being formulated by the Assistant Secretary of the Army to accelerate the planning and study process could severely limit the Corps of Engineers' ability to objectively evaluate and recommend the best project from an engineering and economic standpoint. Further, it appears that the new procedures will confine the study and evaluation process to functions and

areas predetermined by administration policy without input from the Congress.

While supporting efforts to reduce the time required to study and plan a water resource project, the Committee expects the Corps of Engineers to continue to provide an objective evaluation which can then be reviewed by the administration and the Congress for policy considerations.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

Appropriations, 1988	$1,200,175,000
Budget estimate, 1989	1,227,570,000
House allowance	1,193,687,000
Committee recommendation	1,184,735,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−42,835,000
House allowance	−8,952,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $1,184,735,000. This is $42,835,000 under the budget request for fiscal 1989 and $8,952,000 under the House allowance.

The following table shows each project for which funds are recommended. Immediately following the table, the Committee has outlined special reductions and changes made in the budgeted projects together with selected other Committee actions.

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		HOUSE ALLOWANCE		SENATE ALLOWANCE	
		INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
	PUERTO RICO						
(FDP)	ARECIBO RIVER, PR	160,000	---	160,000	---	160,000	---
(FDP)	GUAMAJIBO RIVER, PR	210,000	---	210,000	---	210,000	---
(FDP)	GUAYANILLA RIVER BASIN, PR	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	RIO NIGUA AT SALINAS, PR	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FC)	RIO PUERTO NUEVO, PR	---	1,700,000	---	1,700,000	---	1,700,000
	SOUTH CAROLINA						
(FDP)	SOUTH CAROLINA COASTLINE COMPREHENSIVE	---	---	---	---	250,000	---
(BE)	FOLLY BEACH	---	---	---	---	---	300,000
	SOUTH DAKOTA						
(FDP)	JAMES RIVER BASIN, SD	25,000	---	25,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	WATERTOWN AND VICINITY, SD	125,000	---	125,000	---	125,000	---
(FDP)	SIOUX FALLS, SIOUX RIVER	---	---	---	---	322,000	---
	TENNESSEE						
(FDP)	METROPOLITAN REGION OF NASHVILLE, TN	273,000	---	273,000	---	273,000	---
	TEXAS						
(FC)	BEALS CREEK, BIG SPRING, TX	---	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000
(N)	BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, TX (42-FOOT PROJECT)	---	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000
(N)	BRAZOS RIVER DIVERSION CHANNEL, TX	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	BRAZOS RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, TX & NM	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---
(FDP)	CAMERON COUNTY, TX	375,000	---	375,000	---	375,000	---
(FDP)	CENTRAL COLORADO RIVER BASIN, TX	270,000	---	270,000	---	270,000	---
(N)	CHANNEL TO VICTORIA, TX	---	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000
(RCP)	DALLAS FLOODWAY, TX	75,000	---	75,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	DENISON DAM-LAKE TEXOMA, OK AND TX	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FDP)	EL PASO AND VICINITY, TX & NM	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FC)	FIVE MILE CREEK, DALLAS, TX	---	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000
(FDP)	FT. BEND & BRAZORIA COUNTIES, TX	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(N)	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, TX (SEC. 216)	---	---	100,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	HILLEBRANDT BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, TX	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	LITTLE FOSSIL CREEK, VICINITY OF HALTOM CITY, TX	75,000	---	75,000	---	75,000	---
(N)	MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL, TX	---	---	300,000	---	---	---
(FC)	SIMS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	---	455,000	---	455,000	---	455,000
(N)	TEXAS CITY CHANNEL, TX (50-FOOT PROJECT)	---	413,000	---	413,000	---	413,000
(FDP)	TRINITY RIVER COMPREHENSIVE FLOODPLAIN STUDY, TX	---	---	450,000	---	275,000	---
(FC)	UPPER WHITE OAK BAYOU & TRIBUTARIES, VICINITY OF HOUST	---	409,000	---	409,000	---	409,000

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		HOUSE ALLOWANCE		SENATE ALLOWANCE	
		INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
	UTAH						
(FDP)	BEAR RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, UT, ID & WY	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
	VIRGINIA						
(N)	JAMES RIVER NAVIGATION, VA	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	ROANOKE RIVER, UPPER BASIN, VA	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FC)	ROANOKE RIVER UPPER BASIN, VA, HEADWATERS AREA	---	465,000	---	465,000	---	465,000
(BE)	VIRGINIA BEACH, VA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	---	660,000	---	660,000	---	660,000
(FC)	UPPER JAMES RIVER BASIN	---	---	---	---	---	300,000
(FDP)	WAYNESBORO, VA	175,000	---	175,000	---	175,000	---
	WASHINGTON						
(FC)	CENTRALIA, WA	---	650,000	---	650,000	---	650,000
(N)	GRAYS HARBOR, CHEHALIS & HOQUIAM RIVER, WA	---	1,070,000	---	1,300,000	---	1,300,000
(RCP)	HOWARD HANSON DAM, WA	---	---	60,000	---	---	---
(N)	OLYMPIA HARBOR, WA	109,000	---	109,000	---	109,000	---
(N)	SNOHOMISH RIVER & TRIBS, WA	125,000	---	125,000	---	125,000	---
(FC)	ZINTEL CANYON DAM, WA	---	500,000	---	500,000	---	500,000
	WEST VIRGINIA						
(FC)	CABIN CREEK, WV	---	---	---	250,000	---	250,000
(FDP)	ISLAND CREEK BASIN, LOGAN AREA	---	---	---	---	---	200,000
(COM)	KANAWHA RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE (AUTH REPORTS), WV,	453,000	---	453,000	---	453,000	---
(N)	KANAWHA RIVER NAVIGATION STUDY, WV	750,000	---	750,000	---	750,000	---
(FDP)	LITTLE KANAWHA RIVER BASIN, WV	350,000	---	350,000	---	350,000	---
(FDP)	MONONGAHELA RIVER BASIN	---	---	---	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	MOOREFIELD, WV	259,000	---	259,000	---	259,000	---
(FDP)	PETERSBURG, WV	180,000	---	180,000	---	180,000	---
(FDP)	POTOMAC RIVER BASIN, WV, VA, MD & PA	280,000	---	280,000	---	280,000	---
	WISCONSIN						
(FDP)	LA CROSSE, WI (PHASE 1)	280,000	---	280,000	---	280,000	---
(FDP)	WISCONSIN RIVER AT PORTAGE, WI	---	---	300,000	---	300,000	---

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		HOUSE ALLOWANCE		SENATE ALLOWANCE	
		INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
	REVIEW OF AUTHORIZED PROJECTS						
	COORDINATION STUDIES WITH OTHER AGENCIES	11,100,000	---	8,455,000	---	9,505,000	---
	COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA						
	COASTAL FIELD DATA COLLECTION	2,300,000	---	2,300,000	---	2,300,000	---
	ENVIRONMENTAL DATA SYSTEMS	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
	FLOOD PLAIN MANAGEMENT SERVICES	10,000,000	---	10,000,000	---	10,000,000	---
	HYDROLOGIC STUDIES	260,000	---	260,000	---	260,000	---
	INTERNATIONAL WATERS STUDIES	1,600,000	---	1,600,000	---	1,600,000	---
	PRECIPITATION STUDIES (NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE)	380,000	---	380,000	---	380,000	---
	SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTERS	130,000	---	130,000	---	130,000	---
	STREAM GAGING (U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY)	550,000	---	550,000	---	550,000	---
	TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS	700,000	---	700,000	---	700,000	---
	TOTAL	16,170,000	---	16,170,000	---	16,170,000	---
	RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	22,000,000	---	20,500,000	---	20,500,000	---
	SUBTOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS	89,765,000	42,712,000	95,194,000	57,221,000	93,690,000	54,927,000
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGES	-3,206,000	---	-10,010,000	---	-3,206,000	---
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED UNOBLIGATED BALANCES	---	---	---	---	-5,000,000	---
	TOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS	129,271,000		142,405,000		140,411,000	

TYPE OF PROJECT:

- (N) NAVIGATION
- (FC) FLOOD CONTROL
- (BE) BEACH EROSION CONTROL
- (MP) MULTIPLE-PURPOSE, INCLUDING POWER
- (FDP) FLOOD DAMAGE PREVENTION
- (SP) SHORELINE PROTECTION
- (SPEC) SPECIAL
- (COMP) COMPREHENSIVE
- (RDP) RESTUDY OF DEFERRED PROJECT
- (RCP) REVIEW OF COMPLETED PROJECT
- (PHASE I) AUTHORIZED FOR PHASE I STAGE OF ADVANCE ENGINEERING AND DESIGN IN THE WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1974 OR 1976

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
	ALABAMA					
(N)	BLACK WARRIOR & TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, VICINITY OF JACKSON..	1,905,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
(N)	MOBILE HARBOR, AL.....	258,550,000	16,156,000	9,685,000	9,685,000	9,685,000
(FC)	THREEMILE CREEK, MOBILE, AL.....	13,970,000	4,842,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000
(FC)	VILLAGE CREEK, JEFFERSON COUNTY, AL.....	26,335,000	556,000	3,800,000	3,800,000	3,800,000
(N)	WILLIAM BACON OLIVER LOCK AND DAM, AL.....	121,000,000	40,162,000	31,000,000	31,000,000	31,000,000
	ALASKA					
(MP)	SNETTISHAM, AK.....	133,000,000	127,155,000	5,845,000	5,845,000	5,845,000
	ST. PAUL HARBOR, AK.....	---	---	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
	ARIZONA					
(FC)	PHOENIX ARIZONA AND VICINITY, AZ (STAGE 2).....	231,000,000	114,096,000	41,000,000	41,000,000	41,000,000
	ARKANSAS					
(FC)	FOURCHE BAYOU BASIN, LITTLE ROCK, AR.....	14,000,000	2,763,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
(N)	MCCLELLAN-KERR ARK. RVR NAV. SYSTEM LOCKS AND DAMS, AR	561,000,000	547,453,000	8,500,000	8,500,000	8,500,000
(N)	OUACHITA AND BLACK RIVERS, AR & LA.....	258,000,000	227,046,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
(FC)	RED RIVER EMERGENCY BANK PROTECTION, AR & LA.....	79,440,000	74,140,000	---	4,200,000	2,000,000
(FC)	RED RIVER LEVEES AND BANK STABILIZATION BELOW DENISON DAM, ARK, LA,TEX.....	---	---	---	---	1,000,000
	CALIFORNIA					
(FC)	CACHE CREEK SETTLING BASIN, CA.....	15,600,000	640,000	3,250,000	---	---
(FC)	CORTE MADERA CREEK, CA.....	14,400,000	11,664,000	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,800,000
(FC)	DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) LAKE, CA.....	349,000,000	312,720,000	750,000	750,000	---
(FC)	FAIRFIELD VICINITY STREAMS, CA.....	11,000,000	7,849,000	2,400,000	2,400,000	2,400,000
(FC)	LOWER SAN JOAQUIN RIVER, CA.....	22,576,000	17,074,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
(FC)	MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA.....	65,200,000	5,500,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
(N)	OAKLAND HARBOR, CA.....	21,600,000	7,164,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
(FC)	PAJARO RIVER, CA.....	5,395,000	2,925,000	2,470,000	2,470,000	2,470,000
(FC)	REDBANK AND FANCHER CREEK, CA.....	52,200,000	2,635,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000
(N)	RICHMOND HARBOR, CA.....	8,000,000	1,929,000	430,000	430,000	430,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT, CA (DEF CORR).	74,800,000	72,515,000	2,285,000	3,485,000	3,485,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION PROJECT, CA.....	95,800,000	72,034,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
(N)	SACRAMENTO RIVER DEEPWATER SHIP CHANNEL, CA.....	41,200,000	2,753,000	5,300,000	5,300,000	5,300,000
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY TO STOCKTON, CA.....	132,000,000	53,293,000	1,700,000	1,700,000	1,700,000

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
(FC)	SAN LUIS REY RIVER, CA	32,600,000	5,074,000	6,200,000	6,200,000	6,200,000
(FC)	SANTA ANA RIVER MAINSTEM, CA	941,000,000	16,738,000	15,000,000	---	---
(BE)	SURFSIDE-SUNSET-NEWPORT BEACH, CA	30,200,000	9,722,000	1,300,000	1,300,000	1,300,000
(FC)	WALNUT CREEK, CA	63,400,000	56,247,000	6,300,000	6,300,000	6,300,000
(FC)	WILDCAT AND SAN PABLO CREEKS, CA	21,500,000	10,616,000	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,800,000
	COLORADO					
(FC)	CHATFIELD LAKE, CO	95,000,000	94,123,000	400,000	400,000	400,000
(FC)	FOUNTAIN CREEK, PUEBLO, CO	6,270,000	3,100,000	2,700,000	2,700,000	2,700,000
(FC)	WESTERLY CREEK, CO	7,607,000	776,000	5,100,000	5,100,000	5,100,000
	DELAWARE					
(FC)	DELAWARE COAST PROTECTION, DE	8,750,000	3,179,000	525,000	525,000	525,000
	FLORIDA					
(FC)	CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL	838,000,000	313,335,000	19,000,000	19,000,000	19,000,000
(N)	CROSS FLORIDA CONSERVATION AREA, LAND MGMT. STUDY, FL.	---	---	---	500,000	---
(FC)	DADE COUNTY, FL	48,800,000	36,843,000	1,900,000	1,900,000	1,900,000
(BE)	DUVAL COUNTY, FL	16,400,000	12,957,000	3,443,000	3,443,000	3,443,000
(FC)	FOUR RIVER BASINS, FL	153,000,000	70,710,000	800,000	800,000	800,000
(FC)	INDIAN RIVER COUNTY, VERO BEACH	---	---	---	---	1,000,000
(N)	KISSIMMEE RIVER, FL	10,000,000	23,000	---	300,000	300,000
(N)	MANATEE HARBOR, FL	9,430,000	500,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
(BE)	PALM BEACH COUNTY -DELRAY BEACH REEVALUATION , FL	---	---	---	350,000	---
(BE)	PINELLAS COUNTY, FL	20,000,000	6,998,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
	GEORGIA					
(FC)	OATES CREEK, RICHMOND COUNTY, GA	9,875,000	609,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
(MP)	RICHARD B. RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC	554,000,000	458,500,000	32,000,000	32,000,000	32,000,000
(N)	SAVANNAH HARBOR, GA	8,800,000	3,040,000	5,760,000	5,760,000	5,760,000
	GUAM					
(FC)	AGANA RIVER, GU	4,090,000	2,250,000	1,840,000	1,840,000	1,840,000
	HAWAII					
(FC)	KAHOMA STREAM, MAUI, HI	10,840,000	9,056,000	1,784,000	1,784,000	1,784,000

Red River levee and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, AR.—An amount of $1,000,000 is recommended for the Red River levee and bank stabilization below Denison Dam project for the Corps to replace the failed flood gate and levee in McKinney Bayou and to reshape levees along the Red River in Arkansas. Funding is also included to resume preconstruction planning on the project.

Sacramento River flood control project, CA.—The Committee has included an additional $1,200,000 over the budget request for the Sacramento River flood control project to initiate the design memorandum for levee restoration in the Sacramento metropolitan area. Maintaining project stability has been a continuing problem in recent years and the Committee believes that it is important that restoration work proceed as rapidly as possible.

Columbia River Basin Fish Bypass Program.—The Committee continues to support the program to improve juvenile fish runs at the mainstem dams on the Columbia and Snake Rivers.

The Committee recommendation includes $9,600,000 in fiscal 1989 for design and construction of fish passage facilities in the Columbia Basin. The additional funds are for the following activities: $4,700,000 to construct permanent gate raise modifications and improved collection and transport facilities at Little Goose Dam; $1,600,000 for permanent gate raise modifications, deflector screens, and an expansion of collection facilities at Lower Granite Dam; $1,200,000 is included for construction and testing of longer screens and design of holding and loading facilities at McNary Dam; $1,000,000 is provided for construction of a bypass system at Lower Monumental Dam; $400,000 is for continued design of bypass facilities at Ice Harbor; and $700,000 for continued design of bypass facilities at The Dalles project.

Winfield Lock and Dam, WV.—The Committee is aware that a large number of private property owners will be displaced by the Winfield Lock and Dam replacement project in West Virginia. In order to limit further hardship for those individuals, the Corps should move as expeditiously as possible to acquire the necessary property. The Corps is directed to use available reprogramming authority if additional funding is needed in fiscal year 1989.

Francis E. Walter Dam, PA.—An amount of $1,000,000 is provided for the Francis E. Walter project. The Committee is concerned with the lack of progress being made by parties in finalizing a local cost-sharing agreement on the project. The local sponsor indicated its intent to execute a local cooperative agreement [LCA] in August 1985, and construction funds were appropriated in 1987, but a final agreement has not been completed to date. This can only be taken as either a lack of interest at the local level to proceed with the project. If an LCA is not executed in advance of action on the 1990 appropriation bill, the Committee will be forced to question the need for further appropriations.

Red River Waterway, Mississippi River to Shreveport, LA.—The Committee has provided the full amount of $118,000,000 requested in the budget for the Red River waterway project in Louisiana. The funding

recommended continues work begun in previous years and ensures that the concurrent design of locks and dams 4 and 5 proceeds on the optimum schedule. In order to keep the project on schedule, the Corps is directed to undertake the following work using funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated for the project: Fausse downstream extension in pool 3, $450,000; and in pool 4 Westdale realignment, $1,500,000, Hammel revetment, $1,445,000, Bull revetment, $1,135,000, and Williams downstream extension and revetment; and project mitigation, $2,000,000.

Aquatic Plant Control Program.—The Committee recommendation for the Aquatic Plant Control Program includes $200,000 for Eurasian milfoil control activities at Lake Bomoseen, VT.

Small continuing authorities programs.—The Committee has restored a portion of the reductions made by the House in the small continuing authorities programs in order to continue ongoing engineering and design, and construction. No funds are provided to begin construction on any new project.

Small flood control projects (sec. 205).—The Committee has included $450,000 for engineering and design of the Oceanside Harbor Breakwater, CA, project.

Small navigation projects (sec. 107).—The Committee recommendation includes $1,000,000 to complete the Yellow Bend, AR. project which was initiated in 1988.

Small beach erosion control projects (sec. 103).—The Committee has included $500,000 to continue construction of the Sand Island shore protection project in Hawaii.

Small streambank and shoreline protection projects (sec. 14).—The Committee recommendation includes $75,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate engineering and design of the Newport levee and floodway, AR, project; and $50,000 for necessary studies on the Keystone Dam to Tulsa, OK, levee erosion project.

Mill Creek, Fort Smith, AR.—In fiscal year 1988, Congress appropriated $1,000,000 for the Mill Creek, Fort Smith, AR, flood control project. The Committee emphasizes its continued support for this project and directs the Chief of Engineers to proceed with project construction once the local cost-sharing agreement is entered into.

Nanpil hydroelectric project.—The Committee understands that approximately $800,000 will remain unexpended at the end of fiscal year 1988 for the Nanpil hydroelectric project in the Federated States of Micronesia. The Committee expects that the funds will be used for multiyear operation and maintenance of the facility until expended, and that such operation and maintenance will include a program to train local personnel to assure proper operation and maintenance of the facility following the Corp's departure.

Levisa/Tug Forks of Big Sandy and Upper Cumberland Rivers, WV.—An additional $3,600,000 has been provided for the Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy and Upper Cumberland River project including $2,000,000 to initiate nonstructural measures in lower Mingo County,

85-959 0 - 88 - 2

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
	ILLINOIS					
(FC)	ALTON TO GALE ORGANIZED LEVEE DISTRICTS, IL & MO (DEF.	92,345,000	89,470,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
(FC)	EAST ST. LOUIS, IL	17,250,000	1,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
(FC)	GALLATIN COUNTY STREAMBANK EROSION, AREA 1, OHIO RIVER	1,000,000	87,000	---	900,000	---
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 26, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, ALTON, IL & MO	752,000,000	564,638,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 26, SECOND LOCK, MISS. RIVER, ALTON, IL &	213,000,000	12,136,000	13,000,000	8,000,000	13,000,000
(FC)	NORTH BRANCH CHICAGO RIVER, IL	16,600,000	2,495,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
(FC)	SOUTH QUINCY LEVEE AND DRAINAGE DISTRICT, IL	7,550,000	2,700,000	3,600,000	3,600,000	3,600,000
(N)	UPPER MISS. RVR SYSTEM ENV. MGT PROG., IL, IA, MO, MN,	191,000,000	7,177,000	7,000,000	7,500,000	7,000,000
	INDIANA					
(FC)	EVANSVILLE, IN	49,500,000	32,790,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
	IOWA					
(FC)	DES MOINES RECREATION RIVER AND GREENBELT, IA	4,623,000	964,000	750,000	750,000	750,000
(FC)	MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, IA, NE, KS, & MO	138,881,000	89,919,000	350,000	350,000	350,000
(FC)	RED ROCK DAM AND LAKE, IOWA (LAND AQUISITION)	28,400,000	---	---	1,500,000	1,500,000
(FC)	SAYLORVILLE LAKE,IA 1958 ACT	130,100,000	115,763,000	---	4,800,000	2,000,000
(FC)	WATERLOO, IA, BRIDGES	1,150,000	---	---	625,000	625,000
	KANSAS					
(FC)	GREAT BEND, KS	31,600,000	3,422,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
(FC)	HALSTEAD, KS	5,800,000	642,000	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,800,000
	KENTUCKY					
(FC)	BIG SOUTH FORK NATIONAL RIVER AND RECREATION AREA, KY.	132,072,000	103,522,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000
(FC)	PAINTSVILLE LAKE, KY	63,784,000	59,097,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
(FC)	SALYERSVILLE, KY	2,400,000	221,000	---	170,000	---
(FC)	SOUTHWESTERN JEFFERSON COUNTY, KY	57,700,000	54,617,000	3,083,000	3,083,000	3,083,000
(FC)	TAYLORSVILLE LAKE, KY	92,420,000	82,772,000	540,000	540,000	540,000
(FC)	YATESVILLE LAKE, KY	104,000,000	68,296,000	11,800,000	11,800,000	11,800,000
	LOUISIANA					
(FC)	GRAND ISLE AND VICINITY, LA	14,661,000	11,044,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
(FC)	LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN AND VICINITY, LA (HURRICANE PROTECT	521,000,000	209,041,000	40,400,000	40,400,000	40,400,000
(FC)	LAROSE TO GOLDEN MEADOW, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	69,400,000	51,301,000	2,970,000	2,970,000	2,970,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER - GULF OUTLET, LA	509,000,000	89,717,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER SHIP CHANNEL, GULF TO BATON ROUGE, L	143,000,000	12,127,000	3,800,000	3,800,000	3,800,000
(FC)	NEW ORLEANS TO VENICE, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	225,000,000	62,768,000	12,900,000	12,900,000	12,900,000

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
(FC)	OUACHITA RIVER LEVEES, INCLUDING BAWCOMVILLE, LA.....	8,300,000	2,786,000	900,000	900,000	900,000
(FC)	PEARL RIVER, SLIDELL, ST. TAMMANY PARISH, LA.....	19,200,000	1,362,000	400,000	400,000	400,000
(N)	RED RIVER WATERWAY, MISSISSIPPI RIVER TO SHREVEPORT, L	1,643,000,000	883,053,000	118,000,000	118,000,000	118,000,000
	MAINE					
(N)	JONESPORT HARBOR, ME.....	8,100,000	6,300,000	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,800,000
(BE)	ROOSEVELT CAMPOBELLO INTERNATIONAL PARK, LUBEC, ME & C	200,000	---	200,000	200,000	200,000
	MARYLAND					
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR AND CHANNELS, MD & VA.....	148,000,000	52,767,000	27,600,000	27,600,000	27,600,000
	MASSACHUSETTS					
(BE)	REVERE BEACH, MA.....	7,605,000	858,000	3,510,000	3,510,000	3,510,000
(FC)	TOWN BROOK, QUINCY AND BRAINTREE, MA.....	21,600,000	1,470,000	7,950,000	7,950,000	7,950,000
	MINNESOTA					
(FC)	BASSETT CREEK, MN.....	24,900,000	10,892,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
(FC)	CHASKA, MN.....	20,500,000	2,093,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
(FC)	MANKATO AND NORTH MANKATO, MN.....	95,700,000	93,481,000	2,219,000	2,219,000	2,219,000
(FC)	SOUTH FORK ZUMBRO RIVER AT ROCHESTER, MN.....	61,200,000	6,497,000	7,100,000	7,100,000	7,100,000
	MISSISSIPPI					
(FC)	SOWASHEE CREEK, MERIDIAN, MS.....	13,743,000	2,546,000	5,400,000	5,400,000	5,400,000
(FC)	TOMBIGBEE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MS & AL.....	48,000,000	24,783,000	2,595,000	2,595,000	2,595,000
	MISSOURI					
(FC)	BLUE RIVER CHANNEL, KANSAS CITY, MO.....	174,000,000	26,618,000	9,116,000	9,116,000	9,116,000
(FC)	HANNIBAL, MO.....	4,690,000	1,029,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
(MP)	HARRY S. TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, MO.....	550,000,000	533,490,000	6,445,000	6,445,000	6,445,000
(FC)	LITTLE BLUE RIVER LAKES, MO.....	140,500,000	137,483,000	3,017,000	3,017,000	3,017,000
(N)	MISS. RIVER BTWN OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG. WORKS), MO &	187,000,000	118,445,000	4,400,000	4,400,000	4,400,000
	NEBRASKA					
(FC)	MISSOURI NATIONAL RECREATIONAL RIVER, NE & SD.....	21,000,000	857,000	75,000	75,000	75,000
(FC)	PAPILLION CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES LAKES, NE.....	57,300,000	48,763,000	3,547,000	3,547,000	3,547,000

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
	NEW HAMPSHIRE					
(N)	PORTSMOUTH HARBOR AND PISCATAQUA RIVER, NH & ME.....	11,250,000	3,000,000	6,900,000	6,900,000	6,900,000
	NEW JERSEY					
(N)	BARNEGAT INLET, NJ.....	29,480,000	10,760,000	7,800,000	7,800,000	7,800,000
(BE)	CAPE MAY INLET TO LOWER TOWNSHIP, NJ.....	70,700,000	4,063,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
(FC)	LIBERTY STATE PARK LEVEE AND SEAWALL, NJ.....	18,200,000	13,422,000	4,778,000	4,778,000	4,778,000
(FC)	RAMAPO AND MAHWAH RIVERS, MAHWAH, NJ AND SUFFERN, NY..	5,930,000	696,000	300,000	---	---
(BE)	SANDY HOOK TO BARNEGAT INLET, NJ.....	199,000,000	5,936,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
	NEW MEXICO					
(FC)	ACEQUIAS IRRIGATION SYSTEM, NM.....	40,000,000	1,900,000	---	---	2,000,000
(FC)	ALAMOGORDO, NM.....	22,800,000	1,859,000	7,400,000	7,400,000	7,400,000
(FC)	PUERCO RIVER AT GALLUP, NM.....	5,250,000	713,000	3,100,000	3,100,000	3,100,000
(FC)	RIO GRANDE FLOODWAY, TRUTH OR CONSEQUENCES UNIT, NM...	11,700,000	1,663,000	3,800,000	3,800,000	3,800,000
	NEW YORK					
(FC)	ARDSLEY, NY.....	4,830,000	2,150,000	2,680,000	2,680,000	2,680,000
(FC)	ELLICOTT CREEK, NY.....	10,254,000	9,054,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
(N)	HEMPSTEAD HARBOR, NY.....	2,130,000	190,000	400,000	400,000	400,000
(N)	KILL VAN KULL AND NEWARK BAY CHANNEL, NY & NJ.....	193,000,000	57,019,000	54,300,000	54,300,000	54,300,000
(N)	MORICHES INLET, NY.....	9,100,000	7,875,000	1,225,000	1,225,000	1,225,000
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR COLLECTION AND REMOVAL OF DRIFT, NY &.	51,900,000	29,091,000	1,409,000	1,409,000	1,409,000
(FC)	NORTH ELLENVILLE DEF CORRECTION, NY.....	3,850,000	---	---	450,000	450,000
	NORTH CAROLINA					
(N)	AIWW-REPLACEMENT OF FEDERAL HIGHWAY BRIDGES, NC.....	68,700,000	23,001,000	550,000	550,000	550,000
(FC)	B. EVERETT JORDAN DAM AND LAKE, NC.....	138,000,000	133,532,000	4,468,000	4,468,000	4,468,000
(FC)	CAROLINA BEACH AND VICINITY, NC.....	16,700,000	8,699,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
(FC)	FALLS LAKE, NC.....	165,000,000	147,460,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000
	NORTH DAKOTA					
(FC)	LAKE ASHTABULA & BALDHILL DAM, SHEYENNE RVR, ND (DAM S	36,100,000	1,080,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
(FC)	SHEYENNE RIVER, WEST FARGO AND RIVERSIDE, ND.....	45,200,000	3,633,000	2,700,000	---	---
(FC)	SOURIS RIVER BASIN, ND.....	80,100,000	25,072,000	17,600,000	17,600,000	17,600,000

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
	OHIO					
(FC)	BOLIVAR DAM, MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES, OH (DAM SAFETY)...	7,400,000	4,200,000	3,200,000	3,200,000	3,200,000
(BE)	MAUMEE BAY STATE PARK, OH.....	4,400,000	580,000	---	750,000	750,000
(FC)	MILL CREEK, OH.....	159,000,000	69,035,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000
(FC)	NEWARK, OH.....	10,100,000	8,018,000	2,082,000	2,082,000	2,082,000
(FC)	REMO BEACH HOWARD FARMS, OH.....	5,540,000	1,697,000	1,610,000	1,610,000	1,610,000
	OKLAHOMA					
(FC)	ARCADIA LAKE, OK.....	89,700,000	81,740,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
(FC)	MINGO CREEK, OK.....	110,000,000	3,469,000	6,200,000	6,200,000	6,200,000
(FC)	PARKER LAKE, OK.....	47,100,000	6,110,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
	OREGON					
(N)	THE DALLES.....	---	---	---	---	700,000
(N)	BONNEVILLE NAVIGATION LOCK, OR & WA.....	212,000,000	67,904,000	42,000,000	42,000,000	42,000,000
(MP)	BONNEVILLE SECOND POWERHOUSE, OR & WA.....	672,000,000	654,669,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
(FC)	ELK CREEK LAKE, OR.....	116,300,000	94,693,000	1,900,000	1,900,000	1,900,000
(FC)	LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN BANK PROTECTION, OR & WA...	24,700,000	20,941,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
(FC)	WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN BANK PROTECTION, OR.....	29,200,000	24,848,000	160,000	160,000	160,000
(N)	MCNARY LOCK & DAM.....	---	---	---	---	1,200,000
	PENNSYLVANIA					
(FC)	FRANCIS E. WALTER DAM, PA (MODIFICATION).....	20,600,000	9,429,000	4,200,000	4,200,000	1,000,000
(N)	GRAYS LANDING, LOCK AND DAM 7, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA..	165,000,000	9,980,000	14,200,000	14,200,000	14,200,000
(FC)	LOCK HAVEN, PA.....	58,500,000	2,782,000	1,000,000	---	---
(N)	POINT MARION, LOCK AND DAM 8, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA &.	82,900,000	2,052,000	2,800,000	2,800,000	2,800,000
(BE)	PRESQUE ISLE PENINSULA, PA (NOURISHMENT).....	16,044,000	14,814,000	1,230,000	1,230,000	1,230,000
(BE)	PRESQUE ISLE PENNISULA, PA.....	13,700,000	670,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
(FC)	TAMAQUA, PA.....	9,225,000	1,940,000	1,640,000	1,640,000	1,640,000
(FC)	TURTLE CREEK, PA.....	17,151,000	15,644,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
	PUERTO RICO					
(FC)	PORTUGUES AND BUCANA RIVERS, PR.....	302,000,000	192,702,000	26,000,000	26,000,000	26,000,000
	SOUTH CAROLINA					
(N)	CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC.....	75,350,000	2,535,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
(MP)	COOPER RIVER SEISMIC MODIFICATION, SC.....	28,000,000	23,998,000	4,002,000	4,002,000	4,002,000

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
	TEXAS					
(FC)	BUFFALO BAYOU & TRIBS-ADDICKS & BARKER DAMS, TX (DAM S	10,900,000	9,471,000	1,429,000	1,429,000	1,429,000
(FC)	CLEAR CREEK, TX	50,500,000	5,400,000	4,300,000	4,300,000	4,300,000
(FC)	BOGGY CREEK, AUSTIN, TX	15,800,000	4,452,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000
(FC)	COOPER LAKE AND CHANNELS, TX	133,000,000	48,976,000	21,800,000	22,800,000	21,800,000
(N)	CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX	57,700,000	48,167,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
(FC)	EL PASO, TX	108,700,000	59,965,000	4,400,000	4,400,000	4,400,000
(N)	FREEPORT HARBOR, TX	57,900,000	12,698,000	11,300,000	11,300,000	11,300,000
(FC)	JOE POOL LAKE, TX	184,000,000	178,989,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000
(FC)	LAKE WICHITA, HOLLIDAY CREEK AT WICHITA FALLS, TX	29,600,000	2,205,000	7,500,000	7,500,000	7,500,000
(N)	MOUTH OF COLORADO RIVER, TX	32,600,000	15,865,000	5,800,000	5,800,000	5,800,000
(FC)	RAY ROBERTS LAKE, TX	294,000,000	254,213,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000
(FC)	SAN ANTONIO CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, TX	116,000,000	66,574,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000
(FC)	TAYLORS BAYOU, TX	41,000,000	22,167,000	4,400,000	4,400,000	4,400,000
(N)	WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX	69,300,000	25,822,000	---	2,000,000	---
	UTAH					
(FC)	LITTLE DELL LAKE, UT	33,300,000	8,395,000	7,800,000	7,800,000	7,800,000
	VIRGINIA					
(FC)	HAYSI LAKE, VA	20,900,000	3,000	---	500,000	---
(N)	LYNNHAVEN INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, VA	1,934,000	334,000	1,600,000	1,600,000	1,600,000
(N)	NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS, VA	117,000,000	12,987,000	2,700,000	2,700,000	2,700,000
(FC)	RICHMOND, VA	67,700,000	5,266,000	11,100,000	11,100,000	11,100,000
(BE)	TANGIER ISLAND SHORELINE PROTECTION, VA	2,840,000	264,000	2,576,000	2,576,000	2,576,000
(FC)	VIRGINIA BEACH STREAMS CANAL NO. TWO, VA	4,800,000	4,043,000	757,000	757,000	757,000
	WASHINGTON					
(MP)	CHIEF JOSEPH ADDITIONAL UNITS, WA	413,000,000	373,247,000	6,600,000	6,600,000	6,600,000
(MP)	LOWER SNAKE RVR FISH & WILDLIFE COMPENSATION, WA, OR,	185,000,000	140,337,000	12,200,000	12,200,000	12,200,000
(MP)	LITTLE GOOSE LOCK & DAM	---	---	---	---	4,700,000
(MP)	LOWER GRANITE LOCK & DAM	---	---	---	---	1,600,000
(MP)	LOWER MONUMENTAL LOCK & DAM	---	---	---	---	1,000,000
(MP)	ICE HARBOR LOCK & DAM	---	---	---	---	400,000
(FC)	MT. ST. HELENS SEDIMENT CONTROL, WA	152,000,000	72,618,000	21,500,000	21,500,000	21,500,000
(FC)	MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA (DAM SAFETY)	43,800,000	4,039,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
	WEST VIRGINIA					
(N)	GALLIPOLIS LOCKS AND DAM, WV & OH	336,000,000	69,625,000	60,000,000	60,000,000	60,000,000
(FC)	LEVISA & TUG FORKS & UPPER CUMBERLAND RIVER, WV, KY, &	468,000,000	160,150,000	42,400,000	47,400,000	46,000,000

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
(FC)	STONEWALL JACKSON LAKE, WV	212,000,000	189,639,000	13,300,000	13,300,000	13,300,000
(N)	WINFIELD LOCK AND DAM, WV	153,000,000	3,190,000	6,500,000	6,500,000	6,500,000
	WISCONSIN					
(FC)	STATE ROAD AND EBNER COULEES, WI	26,600,000	2,112,000	6,400,000	6,400,000	6,400,000
	MISCELLANEOUS					
	AQUATIC PLANT CONTROL (1965 ACT)	---	---	7,900,000	7,900,000	7,900,000
	BEACH EROSION CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 103)	---	---	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,500,000
	COST SHARED DISPOSAL OF DREDGED MATERIAL ON BEACHES	---	---	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
	EMERGENCY STREAMBANK AND SHORELINE PROTECTION (SEC 14)	---	---	10,000,000	5,500,000	7,500,000
	EMPLOYEE'S COMPENSATION	---	---	13,042,000	13,042,000	13,042,000
	FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 205)	---	---	30,000,000	20,600,000	25,000,000
	INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD - BOARD EXPENSES	---	---	80,000	20,000	20,000
	INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD - CORPS EXPENSES	---	---	200,000	100,000	100,000
	MITIGATION OF SHORE DAMAGE (SECTION 111)	---	---	500,000	500,000	500,000
	NAVIGATION PROJECTS (SECTION 107)	---	---	14,000,000	8,350,000	10,500,000
	SMALL SNAGGING AND CLEARING PROJECTS (SECTION 208)	---	---	500,000	500,000	500,000
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	---	---	-118,332,000	-130,000,000	-118,332,000
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED UNOBLIGATED BALANCES	---	---	---	---	-32,000,000
	TOTAL CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL			1,227,570,000	1,193,687,000	1,184,735,000

TYPE OF PROJECT:
- (N) NAVIGATION
- (FC) FLOOD CONTROL
- (BE) BEACH EROSION CONTROL
- (MP) MULTIPLE-PURPOSE, INCLUDING POWER

$1,500,000 for land acquisition at Matewan, in West Virginia; and $100,000 for design activities at Grundy, VA.

Given the importance of the Levisa and Tug Forks project for providing needed flood protection into the area, the Committee expects the Corps of Engineers to take all appropriate steps to keep the project on schedule and to request additional funds, if needed, through the reprogramming process to ensure current schedules are met.

North Branch, Chicago River, IL.—The Committee understands that the funds provided in fiscal year 1988 for the North Branch, Chicago River to reimburse the local sponsor for its costs as authorized by section 401(a) of Public Law 99–662 have not been released as anticipated by the Congress. In light of this situation, the Committee directs the Corps to perform an audit of the sponsor's costs and to release the previously appropriated funds for reimbursement as expeditiously as possible.

Shawnee, OK, small snagging and clearing project.—The Committee recommendation includes $200,000 to complete snagging and clearing work on the South Deer Creek near Shawnee, OK, downstream from Twin Lakes and above the North Canadian River which has already been initiated.

Elk Creek Lake, OR.—The Committee is distressed by the waste of funds and adverse economic and environmental impacts presently resulting and certain to continue to result from the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals' decision to enjoin Corps of Engineers activities at the Elk Creek Lake project in Oregon. The court's interpretation of NEPA compliance requirements has halted construction of the Elk Creek dam at one-third its design height. By the end of fiscal year 1988, approximately $100,000,000 will have been invested in an incomplete project that is unable to provide any benefits and will leave the Federal Government with extraordinary maintenance responsibilities and indefinite future financial commitments. Of particular concern to the Committee are the continuing environmental risks, both known and unknown, that are posed to the Rogue Basin area by the uncompleted dam structure. The erosion of stockpiled materials and disturbance of ground cover and vegetation will result in reduced water quality, increased turbidity and a general degradation of the environment until such time as the project is completed or the area is stabilized. Furthermore, the absence of a functioning dam will result in continued flood problems and water shortages. The lack of water storage that could otherwise be provided by the project is particularly regrettable during this period of extreme drought in the Rogue Basin.

The Committee understands that the Corps of Engineers is proceeding expeditiously to complete the studies necessary to satisfy various unforeseen requirements imposed by the ninth circuit's decision. The Committee also understands that the Corps' record of decision is scheduled to be completed in April 1990. The Committee further understands that the Department of Justice has filed a petition for writ of certiorari with the U.S. Supreme Court to appeal the decision of the ninth circuit. This Committee supports both these actions.

However, the Committee is concerned that the partially constructed dam may place the area at greater risk than is necessary. Therefore, the Committee directs that the Corps, in conjunction with its submission of the fiscal year 1990 budget request, to provide a report on the magnitude of the risk to be faced, if the dam is to remain in this uncompleted condition.

Lower Snake River fish and wildlife compensation plan, WA.—The Committee has provided the full budget request of $12,200,000 and urges the Corps of Engineers to allocate a portion of these funds to undertake the game farm alternative to enhance wildlife habitat in the area.

Canaveral Harbor, FL, sand bypass system.—The Committee notes that the general design memorandum for the Canaveral Harbor, FL, sand bypass system is scheduled to be completed during fiscal year 1988. Accordingly, the Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to utilize available funds to proceed with continued engineering and design for this facility.

FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES

Appropriations, 1988	$20,000,000
Budget estimate, 1989	25,000,000
House allowance	25,000,000
Committee recommendation	20,000,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−5,000,000
House allowance	−5,000,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $20,000,000 for flood control and coastal emergencies.

This activity provides for flood emergency preparation, flood fighting and rescue operations, and repair of flood control and Federal hurricane and shore protection works. It also provides for emergency supplies of clean drinking water where the source has been contaminated and, in drought distressed areas, provision of adequate supplies of water for human and livestock consumption. In the event of a major flood or coastal emergency, additional funds will be requested.

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, ARKANSAS, ILLINOIS, KENTUCKY, LOUISIANA, MISSISSIPPI, MISSOURI, AND TENNESSEE

Appropriations, 1988	$317,704,000
Budget estimate, 1989	334,297,000
House allowance	337,980,000
Committee recommendation	337,980,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+3,683,000
House allowance	

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $337,980,000, which is the same as below the House allowance.

The following table shows the distribution of the funds recommended with the budget request and the House allowance for activities and projects under this account.

Bird's Point-New Madrid Floodway, MO.—The Committee is aware of the concern of the State of Missouri regarding the operation of the New Madrid Floodway and the impact that operation could have on the local environment. Because of these concerns, the Committee has included $500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate and complete the Bird's Point-New Madrid Floodway reconnaissance level study, to conduct public hearings, and to coordinate with other agencies regarding alternatives to the operation of the floodway.

West Memphis, AR. and vicinity, AR.—The Committee has included $500,000 for the West Memphis, AR, flood control study. Given the importance of this work and the need for flood protection in the area, the Committee would have no objection to the Corps of Engineers reprogramming available funds to begin an interim flood protection study for West Memphis in the current fiscal year.

Yazoo backwater pumping plant.—An amount of $4,000,000 has been included in the bill for the continued construction of the Yazoo backwater pumping plant project in Mississippi. The Committee wishes to point out that initial construction funding was appropriated in fiscal year 1984 prior to the enactment of Public Law 99–662, and that the initial construction contract was awarded on March 25, 1986. Further, work was performed and costs reimbursed by the Corps of Engineers on April 29, 1986. Since funds were appropriated and work was actually begun prior to April 30, 1986, the Committee believes that the requirements of Public Law 99–662 do not apply. Therefore, the Committee directs the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers to obligate the funds appropriated for this critical element of the Mississippi River and tributaries project.

Eight Mile Creek, AR.—The Committee has been informed that debris and other material have been allowed to collect just south of the juncture of Eight Mile Creek where it merges with Locust Creek and that this obstruction greatly impairs the drainage of the creek. The Corps of Engineers is urged to conduct necessary hydraulic analysis and to remove the blockage using available O&M funds.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

Appropriations, 1988	$1,400,000,000
Budget estimate, 1989	1,372,894,000
House allowance	1,378,833,000
Committee recommendation	1,362,894,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−10,000,000
House allowance	−15,939,000

An appropriation of $1,362,894,000 is recommended, which is $10,000,000 under the budget request and $15,939,000 below the House allowance.

The Committee is aware of growing operation and maintenance requirements nationwide, and the continuously changing needs and priorities. It is often necessary to accomplish work scheduled for the budget year in the current year, and it is not uncommon for the Corps

to divert budgeted operation and maintenance funds to unscheduled work due to meet unforeseen emergency requirements.

Further, the Committee is aware of the efforts of the Corps to stretch their scarce O&M dollars to cover all of its projects and to effect savings through a variety of methods. As more and more projects come into the inventory and budgetary constraints reduce available resources, it is clear the Corps will need to change its traditional approach to undertaking the required O&M work nationwide. Adjustments in lower priority programs and noncritical work should be considered. However, in optimizing its use of the limited resources available, the Corps should insure maximum public benefits for navigation, hydropower, and flood control.

The 1989 budget request was based on estimates which were developed 18 months ago. Maintenance dredging requirements in navigation channels vary with weather conditions, equipment availability, and usage. Further, good bid experience could free up additional dollars to accomplish unscheduled work. Specific allocations for O&M projects impede the Corps' ability to adjust to continuously changing needs. Only if the Corps' financial flexibility to respond to emergencies and other unanticipated urgent requirements is preserved can the Chief of Engineers carry out his responsibility to perform the O&M work of greatest overall importance to the Nation.

Therefore, the Committee prefers not to make specific allocations to projects and has included tables in the report for illustrative purposes only.

In addition, the attention of the Corps of Engineers is directed to the following projects in need of maintenance or review and for which the Committee has received requests—Redondo Beach, Kings Harbor, CA; additional maintenance dredging at the small Oregon coastal ports, particularly Gold Beach, and Port Orford; Bayou La Batre, LA; operation and maintenance of streambank erosion control structures constructed as part of the section 22 demonstration program; the ongoing need for additional funds for bank restoration works in the Southwest Pass of the Mississippi River; the need to proceed expeditiously with repairs of the breach in the North Jetty at Coos Bay, OR, using available funds; maintenance dredging of Morehead City Channel, NC.

Astoria, OR.—The Committee understands that new economic data now supports replacing failing sheet-pile wingwalls at Astoria, OR, east marina boat basin. The Corps is directed to proceed as expeditiously as possible with such repairs using available funds.

West Pearl River navigation, LA.—The Committee has provided funds to dredge the West Pearl River in order to reopen it to navigation. The funds provided are to be used to dredge the channel to a depth of at least 7 feet and to make necessary repairs.

McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River navigation system, AR.—Within the amount provided for the McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River navigation system, $500,000 is to begin a program to install tow haulage equipment at locks and dams No. 3 through David D. Terry Lock and Dam.

Kentucky River Locks and Dams Nos. 5–14, KY.—The Committee understands that in order to provide an orderly transition of operation and maintenance responsibility of Locks and Dams Nos. 5–14 on the Kentucky River from the Federal Government to the State of Kentucky an additional year of limited maintenance of the locks and dams in fiscal year 1989 is needed. Based on the understanding between the Corps and the State that this requirement will not extend beyond 1989, the Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to use available funds to continue current operation and maintenance activities on Locks and Dams Nos. 5–14 in fiscal 1989.

Clatskanie River, OR.—The Corps of Engineers is encouraged to work cooperatively and in a material way with the community of Clatskanie, OR, in determining their needs for dredging the channel in their community.

Sunlight Bay Park, Lake Nimrod, AR.—The Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to use available funds to carry out their agreement with Yell County, AR, relating to the access road to Sunlight Bay Park.

The following table is included for illustrative purposes only and shows the estimated work allowances for fiscal year 1989.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

PROJECT TITLE	RECOMMENDATION
ALABAMA	
ALABAMA - COOSA RIVER, AL	2,381,000
BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, AL	12,836,000
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY (MOBILE DISTRICT), AL	3,965,000
MILLERS FERRY LOCK & DAM - WILLIAM "BILL" DANNELLY LAK	3,187,000
MOBILE HARBOR, AL	4,774,000
ROBERT F. HENRY LOCK AND DAM, AL	2,800,000
TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY, AL & MS	17,939,000
WALTER F GEORGE LOCK AND DAM, AL & GA	5,889,000
ALASKA	
ANCHORAGE HARBOR, AK	2,029,000
BETHEL SMALL BOAT HARBOR, AK	500,000
CHENA RIVER LAKES, AK	1,018,000
DILLINGHAM SMALL BOAT HARBOR, AK	363,000
HOMER SMALL BOAT HARBOR, AK	342,000
NINILCHIK HARBOR, AK	238,000
NOME HARBOR, AK	512,000
WRANGELL NARROWS, AK	974,000
ARIZONA	
ALAMO DAM, AZ	1,346,000
PAINTED ROCK DAM, AZ	638,000
WHITLOW RANCH DAM, AZ	54,000
ARKANSAS	
BEAVER LAKE, AR	4,450,000
BLAKELY MT DAM - LAKE OUACHITA, AR	3,823,000
BLUE MOUNTAIN LAKE, AR	731,000
BULL SHOALS LAKE, AR	4,951,000
DARDANELLE LOCK AND DAM, AR	3,939,000
DEGRAY LAKE, AR	3,655,000
DEQUEEN LAKE, AR	707,000
DIERKS LAKE, AR	821,000
GILLHAM LAKE, AR	741,000
GREERS FERRY LAKE, AR	4,440,000
HELENA HARBOR, AR	435,000
MCCLELLAN - KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR.	19,708,000
MILLWOOD LAKE, AR	1,600,000
NARROWS DAM - LAKE GREESON, AR	2,230,000
NIMROD LAKE, AR	908,000
NORFORK LAKE, AR	2,779,000
OSCEOLA HARBOR, AR	545,000
OUACHITA AND BLACK RIVERS, AR & LA	6,081,000
OZARK-JETA TAYLOR LOCK AND DAM, AR	2,896,000
WHITE RIVER, AR	2,017,000
CALIFORNIA	
BLACK BUTTE LAKE, CA	1,227,000
BUCHANAN DAM - H.V. EASTMAN LAKE, CA	1,245,000
COYOTE VALLEY DAM - LAKE MENDOCINO, CA	1,447,000
CRESCENT CITY HARBOR, CA	820,000

PROJECT TITLE	RECOMMENDATION
DRY CREEK - WARM SPRINGS LAKE AND CHANNEL, CA	1,845,000
FARMINGTON DAM, CA	115,000
HIDDEN DAM - HENSLEY LAKE, CA	1,286,000
HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY, CA	4,000,000
ISABELLA LAKE, CA	2,040,000
LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA	2,144,000
LOS ANGELES - LONG BEACH HARBOR MODEL, CA	150,000
MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA	132,000
MOJAVE RIVER RESERVOIR, CA	1,243,000
MORRO BAY HARBOR, CA	15,000
NAPA RIVER, CA	---
NEW HOGAN LAKE, CA	1,900,000
NEW MELONES LAKE, CA	602,000
OAKLAND HARBOR, CA	1,682,000
OCEANSIDE EXPERIMENTAL SAND BYPASS SYSTEM, CA	4,170,000
PINE FLAT LAKE, CA	1,482,000
REDWOOD CITY, CA	2,090,000
RICHMOND HARBOR, CA	2,050,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER - SHALLOW DRAFT CHANNEL, CA	80,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (DEBRIS CONTROL), CA.	699,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER - 30' CHANNEL, CA	2,060,000
SAN FRANCISCO BAY - DELTA MODEL STRUCTURE, CA	1,086,000
SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR, CA	1,865,000
SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR AND BAY (DRIFT REMOVAL), CA	1,460,000
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER, CA	1,014,000
SAN PABLO BAY AND MARE ISLAND STRAIT, CA	3,095,000
SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN, CA	1,712,000
SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA	755,000
SUCCESS LAKE, CA	1,130,000
SUISUN BAY CHANNEL, CA	945,000
TERMINUS DAM - LAKE KAWEAH, CA	1,121,000
VENTURA MARINA, CA	1,515,000
YUBA RIVER, CA	25,000
COLORADO	
BEAR CREEK LAKE, CO	287,000
CHATFIELD LAKE, CO	1,161,000
CHERRY CREEK LAKE, CO	375,000
JOHN MARTIN RESERVOIR, CO	1,685,000
TRINIDAD LAKE, CO	548,000
CONNECTICUT	
BLACK ROCK LAKE, CT	311,000
COLEBROOK RIVER LAKE, CT	297,000
HANCOCK BROOK LAKE, CT	98,000
HOP BROOK LAKE, CT	597,000
MANSFIELD HOLLOW LAKE, CT	271,000
NEW HAVEN HARBOR, CT	600,000
NORTHFIELD BROOK LAKE, CT	136,000
STAMFORD HURRICANE BARRIER, CT	160,000
THOMASTON DAM, CT	356,000
WEST THOMPSON LAKE, CT	285,000
DELAWARE	
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, CHINCOTEAGUE BAY TO DELAWARE BA	15,000
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, DELAWARE R TO CHESAPEAKE BAY, D	20,263,000
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, REHOBOTH BAY TO DELAWARE BAY, D	281,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
	GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS				
	SURVEYS:				
	GENERAL STUDIES:				
(FDP)	BOEUF & TENSAS RIVERS, AR & LA	6,625,000	575,000	575,000	575,000
(FDP)	EASTERN ARKANSAS REGION (COMPREHENSIVE STUDY), AR.	2,620,000	280,000	280,000	280,000
(FC)	HELENA ARKANSAS AND VICINITY, AR	11,800,000	400,000	400,000	400,000
(FDP)	ST FRANCIS BASIN BELOW WAPPAPELLO LAKE, AR & MO	3,213,000	---	125,000	125,000
(FC)	WEST MEMPHIS ARKANSAS AND VICINITY, AR	11,500,000	300,000	500,000	500,000
(FDP)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN (WATER AND LAND RES), LA	6,563,000	54,000	54,000	54,000
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI & LOUISIANA ESTAURINE AREAS, LA & MS	59,200,000	715,000	715,000	715,000
	NATCHEZ, MS	---	---	200,000	200,000
(FDP)	YAZOO RIVER BASIN MS	9,520,000	360,000	360,000	360,000
(FDP)	ST. FRANCIS RIVER MO. & AR. (FISH AND WILDLIFE)	1,060,000	---	10,000	10,000
(FC)	ST. JOHNS BAYOU AND NEW MADRID FLOODWAY, MO	44,400,000	350,000	350,000	350,000
(FC)	HORN LAKE CREEK & TRIBS (INCL COW PEN CREEK),TN/MS.	2,750,000	283,000	283,000	283,000
(FDP)	REELFOOT LAKE, TN	1,320,000	270,000	270,000	270,000
	COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA	---	270,000	270,000	270,000
	PRECONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING AND DESIGN:				
	BIRD'S PT. - NEW MADRID FLOODWAY, MO	---	---	---	500,000
(FC)	LOWER WHITE RIVER (BIG CREEK AND TRIBS), AR	39,000,000	400,000	400,000	400,000
	NONCONNAH CREEK, TN & MS	---	---	1,318,000	1,318,000
(N)	VICKSBURG HARBOR, MS	55,900,000	---	350,000	350,000
	SUBTOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS		4,257,000	6,460,000	6,960,000
	CONSTRUCTION				
(FC)	CACHE RIVER BASIN, AR	168,000,000	920,000	920,000	920,000
(FC)	CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, KY, IL, LA, MS, MO, & TN	3,075,000,000	94,900,000	94,900,000	94,900,000
(FC)	EIGHT MILE CREEK, AR	9,950,000	546,000	546,000	546,000
(N)	HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS COUNTY, AR	41,400,000	5,300,000	5,300,000	5,300,000
(FC)	L'ANGUILLE RIVER, AR	14,800,000	800,000	800,000	800,000
(FC)	LOWER WHITE RIVER (AUGUSTA TO CLARENDON LEVEE), AR	---	---	10,000	10,000
(FC)	LOWER WHITE RIVER (CLARENDON LEVEE), AR	---	---	10,000	10,000
(FC)	SECTION 6 LEVEES	---	---	10,000	10,000
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO, & TN	1,240,000,000	22,700,000	22,700,000	22,700,000

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA	57,900,000	7,450,000	7,450,000	7,450,000
(FC)	ST FRANCIS BASIN, AR & MO	376,000,000	9,900,000	9,900,000	9,900,000
(FC)	TENSAS BASIN, AR & LA:	(452,000,000)	(6,600,000)	(6,600,000)	(6,600,000)
(FC)	RED RIVER BACKWATER AREA, LA	166,600,000	5,758,000	5,758,000	5,758,000
(FC)	TENSAS-COCODRIE PUMPING PLANT, LA	55,500,000	842,000	842,000	842,000
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	1,460,000,000	31,000,000	31,000,000	31,000,000
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA	139,000,000	11,700,000	11,700,000	11,700,000
(FC)	SARDIS DAM, MS (DAM SAFETY ASSURANCE)	7,400,000	600,000	600,000	600,000
(FC)	YAZOO BASIN, MS:	(1,446,100,000)	(32,600,000)	(32,600,000)	(36,600,000)
(FC)	BACKWATER	262,000,000	110,000	110,000	110,000
(FC)	BIG SUNFLOWER	110,000,000	3,800,000	3,800,000	3,800,000
(FC)	DEMONSTRATION EROSION CONTROL	45,000,000	17,725,000	17,725,000	17,725,000
(FC)	MAIN STEM	157,000,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
(FC)	TRIBUTARIES	236,000,000	4,300,000	4,300,000	4,300,000
(FC)	UPPER YAZOO PROJECTS	369,597,000	5,465,000	5,465,000	5,465,000
(FC)	YAZOO BACKWATER PUMPING PLANT	106,100,000	---	---	4,000,000
(FC)	NONCONNAH CREEK, TN & MS	13,600,000	1,500,000	---	---
(FC)	WEST TENNESSEE TRIBUTARIES, TN	108,000,000	5,100,000	5,100,000	5,100,000
	SUBTOTAL, CONSTRUCTION		231,616,000	230,146,000	234,146,000
	MAINTENANCE				
(FC)	CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, LA, MS, MO & TN	---	60,082,000	60,082,000	60,082,000
(FC)	LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER - NORTH BANK, AR	---	64,000	64,000	64,000
(FC)	LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER - SOUTH BANK, AR	---	40,000	40,000	40,000
(FC)	MISS RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO, TN	---	4,649,000	4,649,000	4,649,000
(FC)	ST FRANCIS RIVER BASIN, AR & MO	---	7,083,000	7,083,000	7,083,000
(FC)	TENSAS BASIN, BOEUF & TENSAS RIVERS, AR & LA	---	2,254,000	2,254,000	2,254,000
(FC)	WHITE RIVER BACKWATER, AR	---	702,000	702,000	702,000
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	---	6,893,000	6,893,000	6,893,000
(FC)	BATON ROUGE HARBOR - DEVIL SWAMP, LA	---	300,000	300,000	300,000
(FC)	BAYOU COCODRIE & TRIBS, LA	---	118,000	118,000	118,000
(FC)	BONNET CARRE, LA	---	501,000	501,000	501,000
(FC)	LOWER RED RIVER - SOUTH BANK LEVEES, LA	---	69,000	69,000	69,000
(FC)	OLD RIVER, LA	---	4,741,000	4,741,000	4,741,000
(FC)	TENSAS BASIN, RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA	---	2,583,000	2,583,000	2,583,000
(FC)	WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO	---	2,739,000	2,739,000	2,739,000
(N)	GREENVILLE HARBOR, MS	---	207,000	207,000	207,000
(N)	VICKSBURG HARBOR, MS	---	163,000	163,000	163,000

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
(FC)	YAZOO BASIN, MS:	(0)	(21,183,000)	(25,683,000)	(21,183,000)
(FC)	ARKABUTLA LAKE	---	2,493,000	3,093,000	2,493,000
	BACKWATER	---	391,000	391,000	391,000
(FC)	BIG SUNFLOWER	---	281,000	281,000	281,000
(FC)	ENID LAKE	---	2,886,000	3,886,000	2,886,000
(FC)	GREENWOOD	---	598,000	598,000	598,000
(FC)	GRENADA LAKE	---	3,470,000	4,870,000	3,470,000
(FC)	MAIN STEM	---	4,704,000	4,704,000	4,704,000
(FC)	SARDIS LAKE	---	3,435,000	4,935,000	3,435,000
(FC)	TRIBUTARIES	---	1,934,000	1,934,000	1,934,000
(FC)	WILL M WHITTINGTON AUX CHAN	---	559,000	559,000	559,000
(FC)	YAZOO CITY	---	432,000	432,000	432,000
(N)	MEMPHIS HARBOR (MCKELLAR LAKE), TN	---	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS	---	1,088,000	1,088,000	1,088,000
	MAPPING	---	719,000	719,000	719,000
	SUBTOTAL, MAINTENANCE		117,378,000	121,878,000	117,378,000
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS, SLIPPAGE, AND PRIOR YEAR UNOBLIGATED BALANCES	---	-18,954,000	-20,504,000	-20,504,000
	TOTAL, FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER & TRIBUTARIES		334,297,000	337,980,000	337,980,000

TYPE OF STUDY OR PROJECT:
- (FC) FLOOD CONTROL
- (FDP) FLOOD DAMAGE PREVENTION
- (N) NAVIGATION

PROJECT TITLE	RECOMMENDATION
MURDERKILL RIVER, DE	250,000
WILMINGTON HARBOR, DE	7,362,000
DIST OF COLUMBIA	
POTOMAC & ANACOSTIA RIVERS (DRIFT REMOVAL), DC	465,000
WASHINGTON HARBOR, DC	20,000
FLORIDA	
BLACKWATER RIVER, FL	36,000
CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL	1,593,000
CENTRAL & SOUTHERN, FL	5,360,000
CHARLOTTE HARBOR, FL	47,000
CROSS FLORIDA BARGE CANAL, FL	1,855,000
FERNANDINA HARBOR, FL	517,000
FORT PIERCE HARBOR, FL	350,000
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, CALOOSAHATCHEE R. TO ANCLOTE R.	134,000
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, JACKSONVILLE TO MIAMI, FL	1,217,000
JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL	2,289,000
JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM, LAKE SEMINOLE, FL, AL & GA.	4,453,000
LA GRANGE BAYOU, FL	6,000
MIAMI HARBOR, FL	1,679,000
OKEECHOBEE WATERWAY, FL	2,438,000
OKLAWAHA RIVER, FL	59,000
PALM BEACH HARBOR, FL	757,000
PANAMA CITY HARBOR, FL	552,000
PENSACOLA HARBOR, FL	207,000
PONCE DE LEON INLET, FL	1,111,000
PORT EVERGLADES HARBOR, FL	35,000
PORT ST. JOE HARBOR, FL	16,000
REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, FL	2,881,000
ST. LUCIE INLET, FL	1,200,000
ST. MARKS RIVER, FL	87,000
TAMPA HARBOR, FL	216,000
GEORGIA	
APALACHICOLA CHATTAHOOCHEE & FLINT RIVERS, GA, AL & FL	4,574,000
ALLATOONA LAKE, GA	5,043,000
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY (SAVANNAH DISTRICT), GA	1,137,000
BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA	5,206,000
BUFORD DAM AND LAKE SIDNEY LANIER, GA	6,567,000
CARTERS DAM AND LAKE, GA	2,756,000
J. STROM THURMOND LAKE, GA & SC	12,837,000
HARTWELL LAKE, GA & SC	6,876,000
RICHARD B RUSSELL, GA	4,519,000
SAVANNAH HARBOR, GA	1,310,000
SAVANNAH RIVER BELOW AUGUSTA, GA	201,000
WEST POINT DAM AND LAKE, GA & AL	3,847,000
HAWAII	
BARBER'S POINT HARBOR, HI	77,000
HILO HARBOR, HI	36,000
HONOLULU HARBOR, HI	36,000
KAHULUI HARBOR BREAKWATER, HI	36,000
NAWILIWILI HARBOR, HI	36,000

PROJECT TITLE	RECOMMENDATION
IDAHO	
ALBENI FALLS DAM, ID	3,281,000
DWORSHAK D&R, ID	6,305,000
LUCKY PEAK LAKE, ID	828,000
ILLINOIS	
CALUMET HARBOR AND RIVER, IL	6,757,000
CARLYLE LAKE, IL	2,677,000
CHICAGO HARBOR, IL	747,000
CHICAGO RIVER, IL	3,157,000
FARM CREEK RESERVOIRS, IL	116,000
ILLINOIS AND MISSISSIPPI CANAL, IL	1,360,000
ILLINOIS WATERWAY, IL & IN	22,185,000
ILLINOIS WATERWAY, IL (LMVD PORTION)	1,076,000
KASKASKIA RIVER NAVIGATION, IL	3,685,000
LAKE SHELBYVILLE, IL	3,948,000
MISS R. BETWEEN MISSOURI R. & MINNEAPOLIS, IL, MN, WI	83,458,000
MISS. RVR BETWN MISSOURI RVR & MPLS, IL & MN (LMVD POR	8,827,000
REND LAKE, IL	2,953,000
WAUKEGAN HARBOR, IL	949,000
INDIANA	
BEVERLY SHORES, IN	30,000
BROOKVILLE LAKE, IN	478,000
BURNS WATERWAY HARBOR, IN	1,373,000
BURNS WATERWAY SMALL BOAT HARBOR, IN	165,000
CAGLES MILL LAKE, IN	545,000
CECIL M HARDEN LAKE, IN	498,000
HUNTINGTON LAKE, IN	503,000
INDIANA HARBOR, IN	87,000
MICHIGAN CITY HARBOR, IN	55,000
MISSISSINEWA LAKE, IN	453,000
MONROE LAKE, IN	674,000
PATOKA LAKE, IN	435,000
SALAMONIE LAKE, IN	450,000
IOWA	
CORALVILLE LAKE, IA	3,275,000
MISSOURI RIVER - KENSLERS BEND, NE TO SIOUX CITY, IA	48,000
MISSOURI RIVER - SIOUX CITY TO MOUTH, IA, NE, KS & MO.	8,221,000
RATHBUN LAKE, IA	1,327,000
RED ROCK DAM - LAKE RED ROCK, IA	2,426,000
SAYLORVILLE LAKE, IA	3,568,000
SMALL NAV PROJ AT SIOUX CITY IOWA - SECTION 107, IA	5,000
KANSAS	
CLINTON LAKE, KS	1,293,000
COUNCIL GROVE LAKE, KS	707,000
EL DORADO LAKE, KS	464,000
ELK CITY LAKE, KS	690,000
FALL RIVER LAKE, KS	794,000
HILLSDALE LAKE, KS	594,000
JOHN REDMOND DAM AND RESERVOIR, KS	923,000
KANOPOLIS LAKE, KS	1,986,000
MARION LAKE, KS	800,000

PROJECT TITLE	RECOMMENDATION
MELVERN LAKE, KS	1,156,000
MILFORD LAKE, KS	1,250,000
PEARSON - SKUBITZ BIG HILL LAKE, KS	814,000
PERRY LAKE, KS	1,595,000
POMONA LAKE, KS	1,097,000
TORONTO LAKE, KS	251,000
TUTTLE CREEK LAKE, KS	2,520,000
WILSON LAKE, KS	1,187,000
KENTUCKY	
BARKLEY DAM AND LAKE BARKLEY, KY	4,246,000
BARREN RIVER LAKE, KY	1,272,000
BIG SANDY HARBOR, KY	1,000,000
BUCKHORN LAKE, KY	715,000
CARR FORK LAKE, KY	833,000
CAVE RUN LAKE, KY	591,000
DEWEY LAKE, KY	834,000
FISHTRAP LAKE, KY	810,000
GRAYSON LAKE, KY	600,000
GREEN & BARREN RIVERS, KY	1,343,000
GREEN RIVER LAKE, KY	1,245,000
HICKMAN HARBOR, KY	482,000
KENTUCKY RIVER, KY	881,000
LAUREL RIVER LAKE, KY	812,000
LICKING RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY	12,000
MARTINS FORK LAKE, KY	478,000
MIDDLESBORO CUMBERLAND RIVER BASIN, KY	78,000
NOLIN LAKE, KY	1,171,000
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, KY, IL, IN, OH, PA & WV	42,717,000
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY, IL, IN, OH, PA & WV.	3,870,000
PAINTSVILLE LAKE, KY	529,000
ROUGH RIVER LAKE, KY	1,507,000
TAYLORSVILLE LAKE, KY	609,000
WOLF CREEK DAM - LAKE CUMBERLAND, KY	3,408,000
LOUISIANA	
ATCHAFALAYA RIVER & BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF & BLACK, LA	5,245,000
BARATARIA BAY WATERWAY, LA	2,211,000
BAYOU BODCAU RESERVOIR, LA	533,000
BAYOU PIERRE, LA	40,000
BAYOU SEGNETTE WATERWAY, LA	10,000
BAYOU TECHE, LA	442,000
CADDO LAKE, LA	110,000
CALCASIEU RIVER & PASS, LA	6,645,000
FRESHWATER BAYOU, LA	953,000
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, LA & TX SECTION	14,913,000
HOUMA NAV CANAL, LA	78,000
LAKE PROVIDENCE HARBOR, LA	229,000
MADISON PARISH PORT, LA	110,000
MERMENTAU RIVER, LA	1,253,000
MISSISSIPPI RIVER OUTLETS AT VENICE, LA	994,000
MISS RIVER - BR TO GULF, LA	48,040,000
MISSISSIPPI RIVER - GULF OUTLET, LA	7,108,000
PEARL RIVER, LA	146,000
RED RIVER WATERWAY - MISSISSIPPI RIVER TO SHREVEPORT,	5,256,000
REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, LA	1,460,000
WALLACE LAKE, LA	150,000
WEST PEARL NAVIGATION CANAL, LA	850,000

PROJECT TITLE	RECOMMENDATION
MARYLAND	
BALTIMORE HARBOR & CHANNELS, MD & VA	4,206,000
BALTIMORE HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS),	110,000
BALTIMORE HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL), MD	265,000
CHESTER RIVER, MD	300,000
CUMBERLAND, MD AND RIDGELEY, WV	73,000
HERRING CREEK TALL TIMBERS, MD	21,000
JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE, MD & WV	1,064,000
OCEAN CITY HARBOR & INLET & SINEPUXENT BAY, MD	426,000
WICOMICO RIVER, MD	900,000
MASSACHUSETTS	
BARRE FALLS DAM, MA	367,000
BIRCH HILL DAM, MA	455,000
BUFFUMVILLE LAKE, MA	258,000
CAPE COD CANAL, MA	6,997,000
CHARLES RIVER NATURAL VALLEY STORAGE AREA, MA	123,000
CONANT BROOK DAM, MA	111,000
EAST BRIMFIELD LAKE, MA	297,000
HODGES VILLAGE DAM, MA	335,000
KNIGHTVILLE DAM, MA	517,000
LITTLEVILLE LAKE, MA	506,000
NANTUCKET HARBOR OF REFUGE, MA	340,000
NEW BEDFORD FAIRHAVEN ACUSHNET HURRICANE BARRIER, MA	373,000
TULLY LAKE, MA	359,000
WEST HILL DAM, MA	297,000
WESTVILLE LAKE, MA	234,000
MICHIGAN	
ARCADIA HARBOR, MI	75,000
CHANNELS IN LAKE ST. CLAIR, MI	836,000
CHARLEVOIX HARBOR, MI	351,000
CLINTON RIVER, MI	38,000
CLINTON RIVER (DIKED DISPOSAL), MI	312,000
DETROIT RIVER, MI	3,975,000
GRAND HAVEN HARBOR, MI	1,059,000
HARBOR BEACH HARBOR,MI	1,129,000
HOLLAND HARBOR, MI	1,653,000
INLAND ROUTE, MI	11,000
KEWEENAW WATERWAY, MI	3,922,000
LELAND HARBOR, MI	107,000
LEXINGTON HARBOR, MI	39,000
LUDINGTON HARBOR, MI	554,000
MANISTEE HARBOR, MI	2,400,000
MENOMINEE HARBOR, MI & WI	12,000
MONROE HARBOR, MI	828,000
MUSKEGON HARBOR, MI	735,000
ONTONAGON HARBOR, MI	748,000
PENTWATER HARBOR, MI	113,000
PORT SANILAC HARBOR, MI	29,000
PRESQUE ISLE HARBOR, MI	83,000
ROUGE RIVER, MI	517,000
SAGINAW RIVER, MI	2,759,000
SEBEWAING RIVER, MI	602,000
SEBEWAING RIVER (ICE JAM REMOVAL), MI	27,000
SOUTH HAVEN HARBOR, MI	29,000
ST. CLAIR RIVER, MI	1,647,000

PROJECT TITLE	RECOMMENDATION
ST. JOSEPH HARBOR, MI	1,069,000
ST. MARYS RIVER, MI	9,866,000
WHITE LAKE HARBOR, MI	35,000
MINNESOTA	
BIGSTONE LAKE WHETSTONE RIVER, MN & SD	198,000
DULUTH - SUPERIOR HARBOR, MN & WI	2,294,000
LAC QUI PARLE LAKES, MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	388,000
LAKE TRAVERSE AND BOIS DE SIOUX, SD & MN	235,000
MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	217,000
ORWELL LAKE, MN	324,000
RED LAKE RIVER, MN	73,000
RESERVOIRS AT HEADWATERS OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN	1,775,000
TWO HARBORS, MN	256,000
MISSISSIPPI	
ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS	94,000
BILOXI HARBOR, MS	416,000
CLAIBORNE COUNTY PORT, MS	4,000
EAST FORK, TOMBIGBEE RIVER, MS	376,000
ENID LAKE, MS	400,000
GULFPORT HARBOR, MS	3,283,000
MOUTH OF YAZOO RIVER, MS	170,000
OKATIBBEE LAKE, MS	1,130,000
PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS	4,986,000
ROSEDALE HARBOR, MS	337,000
YAZOO RIVER, MS	74,000
MISSOURI	
CARUTHERSVILLE HARBOR, MO	358,000
CLARENCE CANNON DAM & MARK TWAIN LAKE, MO	4,452,000
CLEARWATER LAKE, MO	5,566,000
HARRY S TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, MO	6,951,000
LITTLE BLUE RIVER LAKES, MO	787,000
LONG BRANCH LAKE, MO	641,000
MERAMEC PARK LAKE, MO	401,000
MISSISSIPPI RIVER BETWEEN OHIO RIVER & MISSOURI, IL	10,778,000
POMME DE TERRE LAKE, MO	1,268,000
SMITHVILLE LAKE, MO	916,000
STOCKTON LAKE, MO	3,019,000
TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO	4,619,000
UNION LAKE, MO	2,000
WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO	100,000
MONTANA	
FT PECK DAM AND LAKE, MT	4,261,000
LIBBY DAM, MT	4,198,000
NEBRASKA	
GAVINS POINT DAM, LEWIS & CLARK LAKE, NE & SD	5,202,000
HARLAN COUNTY LAKE, NE	1,116,000
PAPILLION CREEK & TRIBUTARIES LAKES, NE	500,000
SALT CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, NE	623,000

PROJECT TITLE	RECOMMENDATION
NEVADA	
MARTIS CREEK LAKE, NV & CA	311,000
PINE-MATHEWS CANYONS DAMS, NV	105,000
NEW HAMPSHIRE	
BLACKWATER DAM, NH	309,000
EDWARD MACDOWELL LAKE, NH	309,000
FRANKLIN FALLS DAM, NH	468,000
HOPKINTON-EVERETT LAKES, NH	832,000
OTTER BROOK LAKE, NH	396,000
PORTSMOUTH HARBOR AND PISCATAQUA RIVER, NH & ME	525,000
SURRY MOUNTAIN LAKE, NH	299,000
NEW JERSEY	
BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	591,000
COLD SPRING INLET, NJ	255,000
DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA, PA TO TRENTON, NJ	667,000
NEW JERSEY IWW, NJ	4,256,000
NEWARK BAY HACKENSACK & PASSAIC R., NJ	3,513,000
RARITAN RIVER, NJ	18,000
SHREWSBURY RIVER, NJ	11,000
DELAWARE RIVER - PHILADELPHIA TO THE SEA, PA, NJ & DE.	18,264,000
NEW MEXICO	
ABIQUIU DAM, NM	4,972,000
COCHITI LAKE, NM	1,227,000
CONCHAS LAKE, NM	2,322,000
GALISTEO DAM, NM	226,000
JEMEZ CANYON DAM, NM	294,000
SANTA ROSA DAM AND LAKE, NM	537,000
TWO RIVERS DAM, NM	359,000
NEW YORK	
ALMOND LAKE, NY	280,000
ARKPORT DAM, NY	154,000
BAYRIDGE & RED HOOK CHANNELS, NY	1,875,000
BLACK ROCK CHANNEL AND TONAWANDA HARBOR, NY	1,791,000
BUFFALO HARBOR, NY	2,089,000
EAST ROCKAWAY INLET, NY	1,500,000
EAST SIDNEY LAKE, NY	266,000
FIRE ISLAND TO JONES INLET, NY	1,400,000
GLEN COVE CREEK, NY	44,000
HUDSON RIVER, NY	2,707,000
MT MORRIS LAKE, NY	1,742,000
NARROWS OF LAKE CHAMPLAIN, NY	40,000
NEWTOWN CREEK, NY	764,000
NEW YORK & NEW JERSEY CHANNELS, NY	1,200,000
NEW YORK HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL), NY	3,055,000
NEW YORK HARBOR, NY	2,902,000
NEW YORK HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS),	650,000
OSWEGO HARBOR, NY	12,000
ROCHESTER HARBOR, NY	845,000
RONDOUT HARBOR, NY	987,000
SOUTHERN NEW YORK PROJECTS, NY	1,524,000
WHITNEY POINT LAKE, NY	272,000

PROJECT TITLE	RECOMMENDATION
NORTH CAROLINA	
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY (WILMINGTON DISTRICT),.	4,427,000
B EVERETT JORDAN DAM AND LAKE, NC	856,000
BEAUFORT HARBOR, NC	43,000
BOGUE INLET AND CHANNEL, NC	675,000
CAPE FEAR RIVER ABOVE WILMINGTON, NC	668,000
CHANNEL FROM BACK SOUND TO LOOKOUT BIGHT, NC	7,000
FALLS LAKE, NC	858,000
LOCKWOODS FOLLY RIVER, NC	546,000
MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY, NC	4,210,000
MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR, NC	1,840,000
NEW RIVER INLET, NC	538,000
NEW TOPSAIL INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC	270,000
OCRACOKE INLET, NC	278,000
SILVER LAKE HARBOR, NC	18,000
W. KERR SCOTT DAM AND RESERVOIR, NC	1,262,000
WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC	4,046,000
NORTH DAKOTA	
BOWMAN HALEY LAKE, ND	225,000
GARRISON DAM, LAKE SAKAKAWEA, ND	6,418,000
HOMME LAKE AND DAM, ND	91,000
LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND	553,000
PIPESTEM LAKE, ND	288,000
OHIO	
ALUM CREEK LAKE, OH	470,000
ASHTABULA HARBOR, OH	4,152,000
BERLIN LAKE, OH	1,284,000
CAESAR CREEK LAKE, OH	651,000
CLARENCE J BROWN DAM, OH	445,000
CLEVELAND HARBOR, OH	4,552,000
CONNEAUT HARBOR, OH	816,000
DEER CREEK LAKE, OH	385,000
DELAWARE LAKE, OH	380,000
DILLON LAKE, OH	381,000
FAIRPORT HARBOR, OH	353,000
HURON HARBOR, OH	720,000
LORAIN HARBOR, OH	1,265,000
MASSILLON LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH	16,000
MICHAEL J KIRWAN DAM & RESERVOIR, OH	619,000
MOSQUITO CREEK LAKE, OH	684,000
MUSKINGUM RIVER RESERVOIRS, OH	3,845,000
NEWARK LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH	16,000
NORTH BRANCH KOKOSING RIVER LAKE, OH	161,000
PAINT CREEK LAKE, OH	508,000
ROSEVILLE LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH	16,000
SANDUSKY HARBOR, OH	1,287,000
TOLEDO HARBOR, OH	7,977,000
TOM JENKINS DAM, OH	277,000
WEST FORK OF MILL CREEK LAKE, OH	464,000
WILLIAM H HARSHA LAKE, OH	530,000
OKLAHOMA	
ARCADIA LAKE, OK	332,000
CANDY LAKE, OK	56,000

PROJECT TITLE	RECOMMENDATION
BIRCH LAKE, OK	503,000
BROKEN BOW LAKE, OK	1,293,000
CANTON LAKE, OK	1,141,000
COPAN LAKE, OK	537,000
EUFAULA LAKE, OK	3,298,000
FORT GIBSON LAKE, OK	2,582,000
FORT SUPPLY LAKE, OK	759,000
GREAT SALT PLAINS LAKE, OK	360,000
HEYBURN LAKE, OK	593,000
HUGO LAKE, OK	1,205,000
HULAH LAKE, OK	642,000
KAW LAKE, OK	1,322,000
KEYSTONE LAKE, OK	2,398,000
OOLOGAH LAKE, OK	1,224,000
OPTIMA LAKE, OK	490,000
PENSACOLA RESERVOIR - LAKE OF THE CHEROKEES, OK	8,000
PINE CREEK LAKE, OK	704,000
ROBERT S. KERR L&D AND RESERVOIRS, OK	2,446,000
SARDIS LAKE, OK	618,000
SKIATOOK LAKE, OK	936,000
TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK	2,760,000
WAURIKA LAKE, OK	980,000
WEBBERS FALLS LOCK AND DAM, OK	2,460,000
WISTER LAKE, OK	4,650,000
OREGON	
APPLEGATE LAKE, OR	639,000
BLUE RIVER LAKE, OR	138,000
BONNEVILLE LOCK & DAM-LAKE BONNEVILLE, OR	12,021,000
CHETCO RIVER, OR	591,000
C&LW RIVERS BELOW VANCOUVER, WA & PORTLAND, OR	10,289,000
COLUMBIA RIVER AT MOUTH, OR & WA	9,926,000
COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN VANCOUVER, WA & THE DALLES, OR.	487,000
COOS & MILLICOMA RIVERS, OR	169,000
COOS BAY, OR	3,689,000
COQUILLE RIVER, OR	342,000
COTTAGE GROVE LAKE, OR	565,000
COUGAR LAKE, OR	803,000
DETROIT LAKE, OR	1,550,000
DORENA LAKE, OR	320,000
FALL CREEK LAKE, OR	292,000
FERN RIDGE LAKE, OR	577,000
GREEN PETER-FOSTER LAKES, OR	1,780,000
HILLS CREEK LAKE, OR	494,000
JOHN DAY LOCK & DAM - LAKE UMATILLA, OR	12,511,000
LOOKOUT POINT LAKE, OR	2,438,000
LOST CREEK LAKE, OR	2,802,000
MCNARY L&D, OR	8,938,000
ROGUE RIVER AT GOLD BEACH, OR	44,000
SIUSLAW RIVER, OR	935,000
SKIPANON CHANNEL, OR	196,000
UMPQUA RIVER, OR	1,340,000
WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN BANK PROTECTION, OR	75,000
WILLAMETTE RIVER AT WILLAMETTE FALLS, OR	585,000
WILLOW CREEK LAKE, OR	283,000
YAQUINA BAY & HARBOR, OR	1,341,000

PROJECT TITLE	RECOMMENDATION
PENNSYLVANIA	
ALLEGHENY RIVER, PA	4,995,000
ALVIN R BUSH DAM, PA	372,000
AYLESWORTH CREEK LAKE, PA	238,000
BELTZVILLE LAKE, PA	609,000
BLUE MARSH LAKE, PA	1,521,000
CONEMAUGH RIVER LAKE, PA	797,000
COWANESQUE LAKE, PA	1,010,000
CROOKED CREEK LAKE, PA	1,253,000
CURWENSVILLE LAKE, PA	393,000
ERIE HARBOR, PA	505,000
EAST BRANCH CLARION RIVER LAKE, PA	692,000
FOSTER JOSEPH SAYERS DAM, PA	454,000
FRANCIS E. WALTER DAM, PA	521,000
GENERAL EDGAR JADWIN DAM & RESERVOIR, PA	153,000
JOHNSTOWN, PA	6,000
KINZUA DAM AND ALLEGHENY RESERVOIR, PA	798,000
LOYALHANNA LAKE, PA	1,078,000
MAHONING CREEK LAKE, PA	709,000
MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	11,504,000
PROMPTON LAKE, PA	263,000
PUNXSUTAWNEY, PA	5,000
RAYSTOWN LAKE, PA	1,815,000
SCHUYLKILL RIVER, PA	2,530,000
SHENANGO RIVER LAKE, PA	1,600,000
STILLWATER LAKE, PA	325,000
TIOGA-HAMMOND LAKES, PA	1,178,000
TIONESTA LAKE, PA	1,033,000
UNION CITY LAKE, PA	317,000
WOODCOCK CREEK LAKE, PA	655,000
YORK INDIAN ROCK DAM, PA	968,000
YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER LAKE, PA	1,230,000
PUERTO RICO	
ARECIBO HARBOR, PR	175,000
MAYAQUEZ HARBOR, PR	160,000
PONCE HARBOR, PR	285,000
SAN JUAN HARBOR, PR	2,039,000
RHODE ISLAND	
LITTLE NARRAGANSETT BAY, RI	266,000
SOUTH CAROLINA	
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY (CHARLESTON DISTRICT),	4,089,000
CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	4,110,000
COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	3,723,000
FOLLY RIVER, SC	250,000
GEORGETOWN HARBOR, SC	4,874,000
JEREMY CREEK, SC	16,000
LITTLE RIVER INLET, SC & NC	650,000
MURRELLS INLET, SC	34,000
PORT ROYAL HARBOR, SC	96,000
SHIPYARD RIVER, SC	584,000
TOWN CREEK, SC	388,000

PROJECT TITLE	RECOMMENDATION
SOUTH DAKOTA	
BIG BEND DAM - LAKE SHARPE, SD	7,089,000
COLD BROOK LAKE, SD	272,000
COTTONWOOD SPRINGS LAKE, SD	115,000
FT. RANDALL DAM - LAKE FRANCIS CASE, SD	7,328,000
OAHE DAM - LAKE OAHE, SD & ND	6,847,000
TENNESSEE	
CENTER HILL LAKE, TN	2,919,000
CHEATHAM LOCK AND DAM, TN	2,686,000
CORDELL HULL DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	2,787,000
DALE HOLLOW LAKE, TN	2,359,000
J PERCY PRIEST DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	1,826,000
OLD HICKORY LOCK AND DAM, TN	3,206,000
TENNESSEE RIVER, TN	13,381,000
WOLF RIVER HARBOR, TN	640,000
TEXAS	
AQUILLA LAKE, TX	497,000
ARKANSAS-RED RIVER CHLORIDE CONTROL - AREA VIII, TX	1,014,000
BARDWELL LAKE, TX	999,000
BELTON LAKE, TX	1,311,000
BENBROOK LAKE, TX	1,145,000
BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, TX	50,000
BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, TX	1,441,000
CANYON LAKE, TX	1,137,000
CHANNEL TO PORT BOLIVAR, TX	58,000
CHANNEL TO VICTORIA - GIWW, TX	140,000
CHOCOLATE BAYOU - GIWW, TX	1,245,000
CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX	3,993,000
DENISON DAM - LAKE TEXOMA, TX	3,687,000
FERRELLS BRIDGE DAM - LAKE O'THE PINES, TX	1,793,000
FREEPORT HARBOR, TX	778,000
GALVESTON HARBOR AND CHANNEL, TX	3,264,000
GRANGER DAM AND LAKE, TX	1,416,000
GRAPEVINE LAKE, TX	1,971,000
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, TX	14,173,000
HORDS CREEK LAKE, TX	795,000
HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL, TX	5,725,000
JOE POOL LAKE, TX	325,000
LAKE KEMP, TX	153,000
LAVON LAKE, TX	1,859,000
LEWISVILLE DAM, TX	3,148,000
MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL, TX	1,070,000
NAVARRO MILLS LAKE, TX	1,331,000
NORTH SAN GABRIEL DAM AND LAKE GEORGETOWN, TX	991,000
O C FISHER DAM AND LAKE, TX	897,000
PAT MAYSE LAKE, TX	837,000
PROCTOR LAKE, TX	1,267,000
RAY ROBERTS LAKE, TX	390,000
SABINE-NECHES WATERWAY, TX	4,627,000
SAM RAYBURN DAM AND RESERVOIR, TX	2,725,000
SOMERVILLE LAKE, TX	2,163,000
STILLHOUSE HOLLOW DAM, TX	1,170,000
TEXAS CITY CHANNEL, TX	1,500,000
TOWN BLUFF DAM - B.A. STEINHAGEN LAKE, TX	1,118,000
TRINITY RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, TX	1,000,000

PROJECT TITLE	RECOMMENDATION
WACO LAKE, TX	1,475,000
WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX	238,000
WHITNEY LAKE, TX	2,189,000
WRIGHT PATMAN DAM AND LAKE, TX	1,790,000
VERMONT	
BALL MOUNTAIN LAKE, VT	409,000
NORTH HARTLAND LAKE, VT	328,000
NORTH SPRINGFIELD LAKE, VT	474,000
TOWNSHEND LAKE, VT	340,000
UNION VILLAGE DAM, VT	357,000
VIRGINIA	
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, VA	1,222,000
CHANNEL TO NEWPORT NEWS, VA	45,000
CHINCOTEAGUE INLET, VA	754,000
GATHRIGHT DAM AND LAKE MOOMAW, VA	1,134,000
HAMPTON CREEK, VA	706,000
HAMPTON ROADS, NORFOLK & NEWPORT NEWS HBR(DRIFT REMOVA	193,000
JAMES RIVER NAVIGATION, VA	2,150,000
JOHN H KERR DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA & NC	5,106,000
JOHN W FLANNAGAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA	868,000
NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS, VA	3,752,000
NORFOLK HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS), V	283,000
NORTH FORK OF POUND RIVER LAKE, VA	295,000
PHILPOTT LAKE, VA	1,385,000
TANGIER CHANNEL, VA	23,000
THIMBLE SHOAL CHANNEL, VA	1,537,000
WATERWAY ON THE COAST OF VIRGINIA, VA	1,578,000
WASHINGTON	
BELLINGHAM HARBOR, WA	13,000
CHIEF JOSEPH DAM, WA	8,163,000
COLUMBIA RIVER AT BAKER BAY, WA & OR	773,000
COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN CHINOOK & SAND ISLAND, WA	2,000
EDIZ HOOK, WA	18,000
EVERETT HARBOR AND SNOHOMISH RIVER, WA	765,000
FRIDAY HARBOR, WA	7,000
GRAYS HARBOR AND CHEHALIS RIVER, WA	4,770,000
HOWARD A HANSON DAM, WA	583,000
ICE HARBOR L&D, WA	4,760,000
LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA	3,906,000
LITTLE GOOSE L&D, WA	4,586,000
LOWER GRANITE L&D, WA	5,827,000
LOWER MONUMENTAL L&D, WA	4,244,000
MILL CREEK LAKE, WA	701,000
MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA	21,041,000
PUGET SOUND AND TRIBUTARY WATERS, WA	654,000
QUILLAYUTE RIVER, WA	400,000
SEATTLE HARBOR, WA	594,000
STILLAGUAMISH RIVER, WA	90,000
SWINOMISH CHANNEL, WA	454,000
TACOMA - PUYALLUP, WA	30,000
THE DALLES LOCK & DAM - LAKE CELILO, WA	6,724,000
WYNOOCHEE LAKE PROJECT, WA	1,456,000

PROJECT TITLE	RECOMMENDATION
WEST VIRGINIA	
BEECH FORK LAKE, WV	573,000
BLUESTONE LAKE, WV	767,000
BURNSVILLE LAKE, WV	919,000
EAST LYNN LAKE, WV	742,000
ELK RIVER HARBOR, WV	285,000
ELKINS, WV	12,000
KANAWHA RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV	6,107,000
R D BAILEY LAKE, WV	1,082,000
STONEWALL JACKSON LAKE, WV	596,000
SUMMERSVILLE LAKE, WV	1,007,000
SUTTON LAKE, WV	1,387,000
TYGART LAKE, WV	1,096,000
WISCONSIN	
ASHLAND HARBOR, WI	245,000
EAU GALLE RIVER LAKE WISCONSIN, WI	387,000
FOX RIVER, WI	1,034,000
GREEN BAY HARBOR, WI	1,678,000
KENOSHA HARBOR, WI	505,000
KEWAUNEE HARBOR, WI	1,028,000
LA FARGE LAKE, WI	21,000
MANITOWOC HARBOR, WI	26,000
MILWAUKEE HARBOR, WI	257,000
SHEBOYGAN HARBOR, WI	429,000
STURGEON BAY, WI	1,255,000
TWO RIVERS HARBOR, WI	581,000
MISCELLANEOUS	
DREDGING RESEARCH PROGRAM (DRP)	7,000,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS	5,033,000
MONITORING OF COMPLETED COASTAL PROJECTS	1,600,000
NATIONAL EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS PROGRAMS (NEPP)	8,000,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS	8,840,000
PROTECTION, CLEARING, AND STRAIGHTENING OF CHANNELS	50,000
REMOVAL OF SUNKEN VESSELS	1,000,000
REPAIR, EVALUATION, MAINTENANCE, AND REHAB (REMR)	4,280,000
SCHEDULING OF FLOOD CONTROL RESERVOIR OPERATIONS	2,342,000
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS	2,400,000
WATERBORNE COMMERCE STATISTICS	3,600,000
REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	-15,027,000
TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	1,362,894,000

TYPE OF PROJECT:
- (N) NAVIGATION
- (FC) FLOOD CONTROL
- (BE) BEACH EROSION CONTROL
- (MP) MULTIPLE-PURPOSE, INCLUDING POWER

1/ SEE NEW APPROPRIATION ACCOUNT -- "GENERAL REGULATORY FUNCTIONS".

GENERAL REGULATORY FUNCTIONS

Appropriations 1988	$55,262,000
Budget estimate, 1989	60,427,000
House allowance	60,427,000
Committee recommendation	60,427,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $60,427,000 for fiscal year 1989 for general regulatory functions. This is the same as the budget request and the House allowance.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers General Regulatory Functions were formerly financed as part of the "Operation and maintenance, General appropriation" account. The appropriation recommended provides salaries, expenses and related costs to administer laws pertaining to regulation of navigable waters and wetlands of the United States in accordance with the River and Harbors Act of 1899, the Clean Water Act of 1977, and the Marine Protection Act of 1972.

REVOLVING FUND

Appropriations, 1988	
Budget estimate, 1989	$35,174,000
House allowance	
Committee recommendation	10,000,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−25,174,000
House allowance	+10,000,000

The Committee has provided $10,000,000 for the revolving fund of the Corps of Engineers. This is $25,174,000 below the budget and $10,000,000 over the House allowance.

No new appropriations are provided for replacement of the dustpan dredge proposed in the President's budget. The Committee recommendation restores $10,000,000 of the House reduction for the Corps of Engineers automation plan. The Committee believes that from an economic and management standpoint, it is prudent to proceed with replacement of the outdated equipment presently being used by the Corps.

GENERAL EXPENSES

Appropriations 1988	$115,200,000
Budget estimate, 1989	123,465,000
House allowance	120,000,000
Committee recommendation	120,000,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−3,465,000
House allowance	

An amount of $120,000,000 is recommended for general expenses of the Corps of Engineers, which is $3,465,000 below the budget request and the same as the House allowance.

This appropriation finances the expenses of the Office, Chief of

Engineers, the Division offices, the Board for Rivers and Harbors, and certain research and statistical functions of the Corps of Engineers.

National Center for Military Utilization of the Nations' Waterways.—The Committee does not concur with the House Committee designation of the Tulsa District as the official Corps of Engineers center for expertise regarding the military utilization of the Nation's waterways. The Corps of Engineers does not have responsibility or authority to develop plans for the movement of military equipment. The Corps has previously studied this issue and provided that analysis to the Military Traffic Management Command which has DOD responsibility. Finally, it is important to note that other Corps districts which have expertise in this area have been proposed to undertake this work and the Committee believes that, if a center of this nature is warranted, any decision should be based on careful review of Corpswide capabilities and expertise.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriations, 1988	$16,590,000
Budget estimate, 1989	12,286,000
House allowance	13,761,000
Committee recommendation	14,250,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+1,964,000
House allowance	+489,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $14,250,000, which is $489,000 over the House allowance.

Gregory County hydroelectric and irrigation, SD.—The Committee has included $500,000 for the Gregory County project in South Dakota in order to determine the feasibility, as required by Public Law 99–662, of various portions of the project for possible development by non-Federal or Federal interests.

Black Hills hydrology study, SD.—An amount of $100,000 is recommended for the Black Hills hydrology study in South Dakota in order for the Bureau of Reclamation to assist in documenting surface and ground water resources within the Black Hills region.

The recommended amounts provided under this heading for surveys and activities are shown in the following table:

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Appropriations, 1988	$703,716,000
Budget estimate, 1989	698,236,000
House allowance	709,332,000
Committee recommendation	712,905,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+ 14,669,000
House allowance	+ 3,573,000

A new appropriation of $712,905,000 is recommended by the Committee. This is $3,573,000 over the House allowance.

The amounts recommended by the Committee are shown on the following table along with the budget request and House allowance.

PROJECT TITLE	TYPE OF PROJECT
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS	
CALIFORNIA	
ALL AMERICAN CANAL RELOCATION	ADV.PL
DELTA WATER MANAGEMENT	PROJ.I
INDIAN WELLS VALLEY GROUNDWATER PROJECT	PROJ.I
KELLOGG UNIT REFORMULATION STUDY	ADV.PL
OFFSTREAM STORAGE	PR
REFUGE WATER SUPPLY	PR
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY	
SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY CONVEYANCE	ADV.
COLORADO	
HIGH MOUNTAIN AQUIFER STUDY	SP.I
UPPER GUNNISON-UNCOMPAHGRE BASIN PROJECT	PR
IDAHO	
OAKLEY FAN GROUNDWATER & RECHARGE INVESTIGATION	PROJ
KANSAS	
ARKANSAS RIVER WATER MANAGEMENT STUDY	SP.I
KANSAS RIVER BASIN WATER OPERATIONS STUDY	SP.I
NINNESCAH RIVER SALINITY WATER MANAGEMENT	
NEBRASKA	
LOUP RIVER BASIN	SP
PRAIRIE BEND UNIT (P-SMBP)	
SOUTH PLATTE FRENCHMAN PROJECT	PROJ

ECLAMATION

	FY 1989 BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
G. M&I	116,000	116,000	116,000
V. M&I	350,000	350,000	350,000
V. M&I	155,000	155,000	155,000
G. M&I	175,000	175,000	175,000
I.INV.	---	475,000	275,000
I.INV.	75,000	75,000	75,000
	---	100,000	100,000
NG. I	150,000	150,000	150,000
V. M&I	142,000	142,000	142,000
I.INV.	120,000	120,000	120,000
NV. I	60,000	60,000	60,000
V. M&I	150,000	150,000	150,000
V. M&I	90,000	90,000	90,000
APPR.	---	---	89,000
NV. I	100,000	100,000	100,000
	---	800,000	800,000
NV. I	75,000	175,000	75,000

PROJECT TITLE	TYPE PROJE
NEVADA	
NORTHERN NEVADA WATER AUGMENTATION PROGRAM.....	PROJ
NEW MEXICO	
ALAMOGORDO WATER SUPPLY.....	
OKLAHOMA	
EAST CENTRAL OKLAHOMA WATER SUPPLY STUDY.....	PROJ
NORTHWEST WATER SUPPLY STUDY.....	PROJ
SOUTHEAST OKLAHOMA WATER SUPPLY STUDY.....	PROJ
OREGON	
JOSEPHINE COUNTY WATER MANAGEMENT STUDY.....	PR
NORTHERN DOUGLAS CO. COOP.WATER RESOURCES STUDY.....	SP.
UMATILLA BASIN PROJECT.....	
UPPER JOHN DAY WATER OPTIMIZATION PROJECT.....	PR
WILLIAMETTE RIVER BASIN WATER OPTIMIZATION STUDY.....	PR
SOUTH DAKOTA	
GREGORY COUNTY, S.DAK.....	
BLACK HILL HYDROLOGY STUDY.....	
TEXAS	
BEDIAS PROJECT.....	PROJ
LOWER COLORADO RIVER BASIN TOTAL WATER MGMT STUDY.....	SP
SAN JACINTO PROJECT.....	ADV.

	FY 1989 BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
NV. M&I	80,000	80,000	80,000
ROJ.INV.	---	---	200,000
NV. M&I	125,000	125,000	125,000
NV. M&I	275,000	275,000	275,000
NV. M&I	167,000	167,000	167,000
.INV. I	100,000	100,000	100,000
NV. M&I	250,000	250,000	250,000
V.PLNG.	250,000	250,000	250,000
.INV. I	125,000	125,000	125,000
.INV. I	75,000	75,000	75,000
FEAS.	---	---	500,000
APPR.	---	---	100,000
NV. M&I	875,000	875,000	875,000
NV. M&I	50,000	50,000	50,000
NG. M&I	870,000	870,000	870,000

PROJECT TITLE	TYPE OF PROJECT
UTAH	
SEVIER RIVER WATER MANAGEMENT STUDY.....	S
WASHINGTON	
YAKIMA RIVER BASIN WATER ENHANCEMENT PROJECT.....	PROJ
WYOMING	
SEMINOE DAM MODIFICATION.....	SP. IN
VARIOUS	
COLORADO RIVER RECHARGE STUDY.....	PROJ.IN
COLORADO RIVER WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.....	PROJ.
SPECIAL INVESTIGATIONS:	
ENVIRONMENTAL & INTERAGENCY COORDINATION ACTIVITIES	S
GENERAL PLANNING STUDIES.....	S
INVESTIGATION OF EXISTING PROJECTS.....	S
MINOR WORK ON COMPLETED INVESTIGATIONS.....	S
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES.....	S
UPPER SNAKE RIVER BASIN STORAGE OPTIMIZATION.....	SP.
VEGETATION MANAGEMENT ALONG THE COLORADO RIVER.....	PROJ.IN
TOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS.....	

	FY 1989 BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
.INV.	100,000	100,000	100,000
INV.I	1,400,000	1,400,000	1,400,000
. M&I	287,000	287,000	287,000
. M&I	150,000	150,000	150,000
NV. I	1,185,000	1,185,000	1,185,000
.INV.	1,859,000	1,859,000	1,759,000
.INV.	475,000	475,000	475,000
.INV.	490,000	490,000	490,000
INV.	240,000	240,000	240,000
INV.	850,000	850,000	850,000
NV. I	100,000	100,000	100,000
. M&I	150,000	150,000	150,000
	12,286,000	13,761,000	14,250,000

PROJECT TITLE	CONSTR TOTAL FEDERAL COST
CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	
CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION AND COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECTS	
ARIZONA	
HEADGATE ROCK HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT (BIA).....	51,500,000
CALIFORNIA	
CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT:	
AUBURN-FOLSOM SOUTH UNIT.....	2,105,863,000
MISCELLANEOUS PROJECT PROGRAMS.....	668,471,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER DIVISION.....	356,506,000
SAN FELIPE DIVISION.....	344,127,000
SAN LUIS UNIT.....	1,332,387,000
TRINITY RIVER RESTORATION PROGRAM.....	298,244,000
COLORADO	
GRAND VALLEY UNIT, TITLE II, CRBSCP.....	252,410,000
LOWER GUNNISON WINTER WATER, CRBSCP.....	20,812,000
PARADOX VALLEY UNIT, TITLE II, CRBSCP.....	81,906,000
SAN LUIS VALLEY PROJECT, CLOSED BASIN DIVISION.....	100,000,000
NEBRASKA	
NORTH LOUP DIVISION, P-SMBP.....	348,610,000
O'NEILL UNIT, P-SMBP.....	173,200,000
NEW MEXICO	
BRANTLEY PROJECT.....	137,282,000
NORTH DAKOTA	
GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT, P-SMBP.....	1,285,580,000

TION PROGRAM

ALLOCATED THROUGH FY 1988	FY 1989 BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
23,105,000	12,765,000	12,765,000	12,765,000
342,831,000	1,500,000	1,700,000	1,500,000
611,132,000	12,860,000	12,860,000	12,860,000
302,348,000	5,231,000	5,231,000	5,231,000
295,080,000	500,000	1,440,000	800,000
541,113,000	27,732,000	24,732,000	24,732,000
252,673,000	11,642,000	11,642,000	11,642,000
61,191,000	7,659,000	7,659,000	7,659,000
---	---	250,000	250,000
43,525,000	7,704,000	7,704,000	7,704,000
69,700,000	10,321,000	10,321,000	10,321,000
218,254,000	14,776,000	24,776,000	23,000,000
8,094,000	600,000	600,000	600,000
130,684,000	5,785,000	5,785,000	5,785,000
319,141,000	26,800,000	26,800,000	30,000,000

PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST
SOUTH DAKOTA	
BELLE FOURCHE UNIT, P-SMBP	49,700,000
WEB RURAL WATER DEVELOPMENT PROJECT	109,800,000
WASHINGTON	
COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT:	
IRRIGATION FACILITIES	3,176,080,000
THIRD POWERPLANT	756,000,000
YAKIMA FISH PASSAGE & PROTECTIVE FACILITIES	37,457,000
WYOMING	
BUFFALO BILL DAM MODIFICATION, P-SMBP	75,865,000
VARIOUS	
BOULDER CANYON PROJECT	38,960,000
MEASURES BELOW IMPERIAL DAM, TITLE I, CRBSCP	485,544,000
SUBTOTAL, REGULAR CONSTRUCTION	
DRAINAGE AND MINOR CONSTRUCTION:	
ALL AMERICAN CANAL PROJECT, ARIZONA	1,680,000
BOISE PROJECT, PAYETTE DIVISION, IDAHO	32,909,000
CHIEF JOSEPH DAM PROJECT, OROVILLE-TONASKET UNIT	88,000,000
COLORADO-BIG THOMPSON PROJECT, COLORADO	2,267,000
COLORADO RIVER FRONT WORK & LEVEE SYSTEM, AR, CA, NV	170,004,000
CULTURAL RESOURCES ACTIVITIES,CA, ND, NE, MT, SD, WY	1,560,000
FRYINGPAN-ARKANSAS PROJECT, COLORADO	503,300,000
GILA PROJECT, ARIZONA-CALIFORNIA	78,115,000
GLENDO RESERVOIR, NORTH PLATTE PROJECT, NE	---
KLAMATH PROJECT, OREGON-CALIFORNIA	49,807,000
LEADVILLE MINE DRAINAGE TUNNEL, COLORADO	15,540,000
LOWER COLORADO WATER SUPPLY PROJECT, COLORADO	630,000
MCGEE CREEK, PROJECT, OKLAHOMA	109,584,000
NEWLANDS PROJECT, NEVADA	27,862,000
NUECES RIVER PROJECT, TEXAS	106,912,000
PALMETTO BEND PROJECT, TEXAS	74,842,000

ALLOCATED THROUGH FY 1988	FY 1989 BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
6,929,000	4,200,000	4,200,000	4,200,000
81,356,000	11,089,000	12,000,000	12,000,000
917,674,000	3,930,000	4,330,000	3,930,000
726,119,000	14,392,000	14,392,000	14,392,000
30,047,000	7,410,000	7,410,000	7,410,000
28,506,000	23,238,000	23,238,000	23,238,000
9,215,000	---	---	5,000,000
334,867,000	20,027,000	20,027,000	20,027,000
	230,161,000	239,862,000	245,046,000
---	1,600,000	1,600,000	1,600,000
28,635,000	2,030,000	2,030,000	2,030,000
74,783,000	9,111,000	9,111,000	9,111,000
1,130,000	1,137,000	1,137,000	1,137,000
53,741,000	12,071,000	12,071,000	12,071,000
1,184,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
493,461,000	6,700,000	6,700,000	6,700,000
77,139,000	335,000	335,000	335,000
---	---	3,500,000	2,000,000
42,362,000	1,197,000	1,197,000	1,197,000
3,334,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
100,000	530,000	530,000	530,000
103,704,000	5,880,000	5,880,000	5,880,000
5,976,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
105,912,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
74,176,000	665,000	665,000	665,000

Boulder Canyon project, NV and AZ, visitor and safety facilities.—The Committee has provided $5,000,000 for the Boulder Canyon project in Nevada to continue work to upgrade the current outdated visitors center and to make critical safety improvements at Hoover Dam. The Committee is aware that just recently two young children were struck by an automobile at the site, a direct result of the narrow viewing area and ongoing traffic congestion at Hoover Dam. The Committee urges the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation to move forward with this project as quickly as possible and to reprogram additional resources, if necessary, to expedite its completion.

San Felipe Division, CA.—The Committee recommendation of $800,000 for the San Felipe Division of the Central Valley project includes $300,000 for the Bureau to continue the feasibility study of delivering project water to the Watsonville area of the project.

Central Arizona project.—The Committee is informed that discussions of concerns related to the reliability of the Central Arizona project system to meet demands of the Tucson metropolitan area and the Tohono O'Odam Indian Nation have taken place between local interests and the Bureau of Reclamation. While the Bureau is proceeding with studies of terminal storage alternatives without specific direction to complete the study and identification of alternatives, southern Arizona may be without redundancy built into the system for the Tucson area. In order to insure this important issue is addressed, the Committee directs the Bureau of Reclamation to, by the mid-1990's, identify options to make the system more reliable.

Glendo Reservoir, North Platte project, NE.—The Committee is aware that the Bureau of Reclamation has restricted flood control operations at Glendo Reservoir, North Platte project, NE, because of excessive seepage from three dikes located west of Glendo Dam and that these restrictions have reduced the flood control pool to 80 percent of capacity. Further, prolonged seepage could cause dike failure endangering downstream residents and property. To address this serious problem, the Committee has provided $2,000,000 for the Bureau to undertake necessary repairs. The Bureau should take whatever action is appropriate, including the transfer of available construction funds, to expedite completion of this project.

Garrison Diversion Unit, ND.—An amount of $30,000,000 is recommended for the Garrison Diversion Unit in North Dakota.

The Committee believes that a number of basic decisions soon must be made as to the direction and scope of the reformulated Garrison Diversion Unit. Essential to these decisions is the completion of several studies and reports: the James River study, the Sykeston Canal study, and the Oakes aquifer study and Pilot Test Program. They are critical to the future of the remaining irrigation features of the project and to the placing of municipal, industrial, and rural water in the Sheyenne River for delivery to the cities of Fargo and Grand Forks, ND. They are also critical to the negotiations of a new repayment contract between the Garrison Conservancy District and the Bureau of Reclamation.

The James River study was mandated in the Garrison Reformulation Act of 1986 and, although Congress last year extended its completion date by 1 year to September 30, 1989, the Committee believes that the completion of this study is critical. With sufficient funds having been provided in prior years, the Committee urges that the completion of this study be expedited to the extent possible.

The Garrison Reformulation Act authorized the construction of the Sykeston Canal as the functional replacement of the Lonetree Dam and Reservoir, providing the connecting link between the McClusky Canal and the James River. The Committee feels that sufficient progress must be made on the study and planning of this canal to determine its feasibility and costs, thus enabling the Conservancy District to determine the nature and scope of their new repayment contract. This is crucial to the future of the remaining portions of the original project. With the information the Bureau has available from earlier studies and the work that has gone on since enactment of the Garrison Reformulation Act of 1986, the Committee believes that by November 1, 1988, the Bureau should have sufficient authoritative data available to enable the district to make the decision mentioned above.

The Reformulation Act also directed the Oakes aquifer study and pilot program. The Committee urges the early completion of this effort so that work may proceed with the contract for test facilities by April 1989.

Minidoka project, ID.—The Committee directs the Secretary of the Interior to use $760,000 of available funds to construct, operate, and maintain or otherwise provide for outdoor recreation facilities pursuant to the memorandum of understanding with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service of April 23, 1964, as amended at Minidoka Dam, Minidoka, project, ID.

Newlands project, Lake Tahoe Dam.—The Committee has been informed that the $366,000 requested for the Newlands project, Lake Tahoe Dam cannot be spent as planned by the Bureau of Reclamation. Therefore, no funds are included in the bill for the project. The Committee understands sufficient funds are available under modifications reports and preconstruction activities if work can be resumed in fiscal year 1989.

HIPLEX.—The Committee recommendation includes $500,000 under applied engineering for HIPLEX water management activities to continue research work related to cloud seeding and pilot training.

Lower Gunnison winter water, CO.—The Committee concurs with the House in providing $250,000 for preconstruction engineering and design activities only on the Lower Gunnison winter water project in Colorado.

Boulder Canyon project, NV and AZ, (bridge crossing).—The Committee is concerned about the long-term safety problems resulting from heavy concentrations of both commercial and tourist traffic on the existing bridge over Hoover Dam. An alternative, the Colorado River bridge crossing, was authorized by the Congress in 1984, but construction has

not begun pending a resolution of State and Federal funding responsibilities. Because of the serious safety hazards, the Committee urges the Bureau to continue negotiations on a funding participation agreement with the States of Nevada and Arizona in fiscal year 1989.

Central Utah project.—The central Utah project [CUP] Bonneville unit is the largest single component part (both in cost and scope) of the Colorado River Storage Project Act of 1956 [CRSP]. Construction of this unit did not begin until 1968 and is now in its 20th year. Based on information supplied by the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bonneville unit is now approximately 45 percent complete. To date, construction has not been initiated on the irrigation and drainage system, portions of the Diamond Fork Power system and several fish and wildlife mitigation measures.

The Committee is aware that the authorization ceiling for the CRSP needs to be increased in order to provide legal authority to begin construction of these critical remaining features of the Bonneville unit. The Bureau has informed the Committee that municipal and industrial [M&I] features already under construction in fiscal year 1989 can be completed under the existing authorization ceiling and will be advanced with appropriations contained in this bill.

The Committee urges the authorizing committees to move expeditiously to raise the ceiling before the conclusion of the 100th Congress noting that repayment to the Government of project costs, with interest owed by M&I water users will not begin until the project is declared substantially complete by the Secretary of the Interior.

From the inception of the Bonneville unit, this Committee has supported it as an integral component of the Bureau of Reclamation's overall construction program. Accordingly, the Committee strongly urges the authorizing committees in the Senate and House to take whatever action may be necessary to assure that the CUP will be completed in order to prevent any construction delays and penalties to the Government.

During the past 2 fiscal years, actions have been taken to reduce the Bureau's administrative overhead expenses to provide greater project efficiency in order to complete Bonneville unit construction by the end of fiscal year 1995. If this date is not met, the Federal Government will incur substantial financial penalties.

On April 26, 1988, the inspector general of the Department of the Interior released his first annual audit of the statutory requirement limiting administrative costs at the Bureau to 20 percent of total appropriations. The inspector general's report indicates that the Bureau has complied with the limitations required under Public Law 99–591 for fiscal year 1987. The audit noted the Congress subsequently changed the definition of administrative overhead in the fiscal year 1988 Energy and Water appropriations bill (Public Law 100–202) to one which is more stringent than existing Federal procurement regulation requirements. For fiscal year 1988, the Committee imposed an $18,500,000 administrative cost limit in lieu of a percentage of the total annual ap-

propriation. The Committee directed this limitation only to the CUP, but is hopeful the efforts taken by the Bureau to become more efficient in Utah will provide a basis for greater efficiency on a bureauwide basis.

For fiscal year 1989, the Committee has included a general provision in the bill under the Department of the Interior reducing the administrative costs from $18,500,000 to $17,000,000 annually pending approval by the Congress of the CRSP reauthorization bill, which the Committee anticipates may eliminate Bureau participation in the irrigation and drainage system and fish and wildlife mitigation features of the project. The Committee expects the Bureau to comply with this limitation without delaying construction of project features in which it remains a participant.

REPROGRAMMING PROCEDURE

In 1987, the Committees provided the Corps of Engineers with increased flexibility to transfer funds without prior notification to the Committees. Before this change, the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation had operated under much the same guidance regarding the level of fund transfer allowed to a project without notice to the Committees. The Committee would like these two agencies to continue to operate under comparable guidelines.

Accordingly, the Committee does not object to the Bureau of Reclamation transferring, without regard to percentage limitation, up to $5,000,000 in any one case to provide adequate funds for settled contractor claims, increased contractor earnings due to accelerated rates of operations, and real estate deficiency judgments, which the Bureau of Reclamation is legally bound to pay. It will also be acceptable to transfer up to $300,000 to construction projects having $2,000,000 or less available including unbudgeted completion projects. The Bureau should report quarterly to the Committee starting after the first quarter of fiscal year 1989 all transfers in the Construction Program of $500,000 or more.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriations, 1988	$151,000,000
Budget estimate, 1989	183,231,000
House allowance	192,331,000
Committee recommendation	183,231,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	−9,100,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $183,231,000, which is $9,100,000 below the House allowance and the same as the budget request.

The appropriation recommended under this heading provides for the operation and maintenance of 37 projects, project areas, or divisions of projects in fiscal year 1989. Projects are operated for power production, municipal and industrial water supply, irrigation, flood control, and other benefits.

Provision is also made for administration of water marketing contracts on Corps of Engineers projects, examination of existing structures, and administration of the provisions of the Reclamation Reform Act of 1982 (96 Stat. 1261).

The Committee supports the priority given by the Bureau of Reclamation to the operation and maintenance funding request for 1989 and encourages the Bureau and the Department of the Interior to continue this emphasis in future budgets. However, the Committee, because of budget constraints and the budgeted increase over the current year, cannot concur with the additional funding added by the House. The Bureau should review their program to determine if adjustments can be made to accommodate the higher priority items identified by the House Committee.

LOAN PROGRAM

Appropriations, 1988	$32,309,000
Budget estimate, 1989	19,022,000
House allowance	29,022,000
Committee recommendation	26,022,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+7,000,000
House allowance	−3,000,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $26,022,000. This is $3,000,000 below the House allowance and $7,000,000 more than the budget request.

This appropriation provides for loans to non-Federal organizations for construction and rehabilitation of distribution systems and for loans and grants to construct small irrigation projects.

The Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956 was enacted for the purpose of encouraging local participation by qualified organizations in the development of small reclamation projects and to provide Federal assistance in the development of similar projects by non-Federal organizations.

The Committee recommendation does not include funds for any new loan commitments because of budget constraints. The Committee has included follow-on funding for three loans started in previous years which were not included in the budget for 1989.

Funds provided under this heading are distributed as shown in the following table:

PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED THROUGH FY 1988	FY 1989 BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
PICK-SLOAN MISSOURI BASIN PROGRAM:					
BOSTWICK DIVISION, NE	---	---	---	100,000	---
CROW CREEK PUMP UNIT (P-SMBP), MONTANA	150,000	---	---	150,000	150,000
EAST BENCH UNIT, MONTANA	24,230,000	23,387,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
FARWELL UNIT, NEBRASKA	43,036,000	40,801,000	660,000	660,000	660,000
OAHE UNIT, SOUTH DAKOTA	490,000,000	41,797,000	65,000	65,000	65,000
OWL CREEK UNIT, WYOMING	7,000,000	6,744,000	15,000	15,000	15,000
VELARDE COMMUNITY DITCH PROJECT, NEW MEXICO	25,544,000	8,473,000	2,435,000	2,435,000	2,435,000
WASHOE PROJECT, CALIFORNIA-NEVADA	353,519,000	42,132,000	405,000	405,000	405,000
WEBER BASIN PROJECT, UTAH	98,273,000	95,532,000	1,494,000	1,494,000	1,494,000
SUBTOTAL, DRAINAGE AND MINOR CONSTRUCTION			48,130,000	51,880,000	50,280,000
SAFETY OF DAMS PROGRAMS:					
CACHUMA PROJECT, BRADBURY DAM, CALIFORNIA	5,050,000	35,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT, LITTLE PANOCHE DAM, CA	405,000	32,000	274,000	274,000	274,000
CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT, LOS BANOS DAM, CALIFORNIA	382,000	23,000	77,000	77,000	77,000
CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT, O'NEILL DAM, CALIFORNIA	1,372,000	22,000	45,000	45,000	45,000
DEPARTMENT DAM SAFETY PROGRAM	5,473,000	3,223,000	450,000	450,000	450,000
INITIATION OF SOD CORRECTIVE ACTION	153,427,000	1,000,000	5,335,000	5,335,000	5,335,000
MINIDOKA PROJECT, JACKSON LAKE DAM, IDAHO-WYOMING	78,000,000	66,114,000	11,685,000	11,685,000	9,185,000
MODIFICATION REPORTS AND PRECONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY	74,365,000	33,709,000	9,250,000	9,250,000	9,250,000
NEWLANDS PROJECT, LAKE TAHOE DAM, CALIFORNIA-NEVADA	800,000	244,000	366,000	366,000	---
SALT RIVER PROJECT, STEWART MTN. DAM, ARIZONA	34,659,000	9,719,000	18,086,000	18,086,000	18,086,000
SEEDSKADEE PROJECT, FONTENELLE DAM, CRSP, WYOMING	27,138,000	24,618,000	2,520,000	2,520,000	2,520,000
VENTURA RIVER PROJECT, CASITAS DAM, CALIFORNIA	3,050,000	30,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
W.C. AUSTIN PROJECT, ALTUS DAM, OKLAHOMA	6,001,000	1,731,000	780,000	780,000	780,000
SUBTOTAL, SAFETY OF DAMS			49,018,000	49,018,000	46,152,000
REHABILITATION AND BETTERMENT:					
HYRUM PROJECT	1,440,000	---	150,000	150,000	150,000
MOON LAKE PROJECT, UTAH	1,000,000	49,000	161,000	161,000	161,000
UNCOMPAHGRE PROJECT, COLORADO	5,618,000	5,020,000	337,000	337,000	337,000
SUBTOTAL, REHABILITATION AND BETTERMENT			648,000	648,000	648,000

PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED THROUGH FY 1988	FY 1989 BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
APPLIED ENGINEERING:					
GROUNDWATER RECHARGE DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.....	18,520,000	---	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
PROGRAM RELATED ENGINEERING & SCIENTFIC STUDIES.....	76,500,000	---	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
ATMOSPHERIC WATER RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PROGRAM.....	---	---	---	---	500,000
TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION AND COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECTS..			334,457,000	347,908,000	349,126,000
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT					
UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN FUND					
PARTICIPATING PROJECTS					
COLORADO					
ANIMAS LA-PLATA PROJECT.....	333,584,000	7,931,000	1,981,000	1,981,000	1,981,000
DOLORES PROJECT.....	411,684,000	279,819,000	26,388,000	26,388,000	26,388,000
UTAH					
CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT, BONNEVILLE UNIT.....	1,699,456,000	797,350,000	143,453,000	143,453,000	143,453,000
CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT, UINTAH UNIT.....	197,544,000	5,823,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
VARIOUS					
DRAINAGE AND MINOR CONSTRUCTION PARTICIPATING PROJECTS:					
CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT, JENSEN UNIT.....	69,790,000	59,937,000	245,000	245,000	245,000
DALLAS CREEK PROJECT.....	129,323,000	118,719,000	198,000	198,000	198,000
MODIFICATIONS & ADDITIONS TO COMPLETED FACILITES	15,028,000	13,511,000	1,640,000	1,640,000	1,640,000
RECREATIONAL AND FISH AND WILDLIFE FACILITIES:					
RECREATIONAL FACILITIES.....	170,989,000	109,195,000	4,183,000	4,183,000	4,183,000
FISH AND WILDLIFE FACILITIES.....	241,442,000	50,873,000	12,817,000	12,817,000	12,817,000
TOTAL, COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT.....			191,005,000	191,005,000	191,005,000

PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED THROUGH FY 1988	FY 1989 BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT					
CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT					
ARIZONA					
CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT, NON-INDIAN DISTR. SYSTEMS....	290,968,000	189,995,000	31,863,000	31,863,000	31,863,000
CENTRAL ARIZONA-WATER DEVELOPMENT (LCRBDF).....	2,945,975,000	1,824,562,000	180,389,000	180,389,000	180,389,000
CENTRAL ARIZONA-SAFETY OF DAMS.....	79,905,000	6,055,000	8,267,000	8,267,000	8,267,000
TOTAL, COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT.....			220,519,000	220,519,000	220,519,000
ASSOCIATED ITEMS					
UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION BASED ON ANTICIPATED DELAYS...	---	---	-47,745,000	-50,100,000	-47,745,000
TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM.....			698,236,000	709,332,000	712,905,000

LOAN PROGRAM

(LIMITATION ON DIRECT LOANS)

Appropriations, 1988	($31,972,000)
Budget estimate, 1989	(17,766,000)
House allowance	(27,766,000)
Committee recommendation	(24,766,000)
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	(+7,000,000)
House allowance	(−3,000,000)

The Committee recommends a loan limitation of $24,766,000, which is $3,000,000 below the amount recommended by the House Committee.

This limitation provides control over the principal amount of loans that may be made under the Loan Program in fiscal year 1989.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1988	$51,690,000
Budget estimate, 1989	50,313,000
House allowance	48,313,000
Committee recommendation	48,313,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−2,000,000
House allowance	

An appropriation of $48,313,000 is recommended by the Committee. This is the same as the House allowance.

This appropriation finances the general administrative and technical direction of the reclamation program as performed by the Commissioner's office, Denver office, and other offices in the five regions of the Bureau of Reclamation.

EMERGENCY FUND

Appropriations, 1988	$1,000,000
Budget estimate, 1989	1,000,000
House allowance	1,000,000
Committee recommendation	1,000,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $1,000,000 which is the same as the House allowance and the budget request.

This fund is used to assure continuous operation of all projects and project facilities governed by Federal reclamation law in the event of drought, canal bank failure, electrical system failures, municipal and industrial water delivery system failures, or other emergencies.

WORKING CAPITAL FUND

Appropriations, 1988	
Budget estimate, 1989	$7,900,000
House allowance	
Committee recommendation	7,900,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	+7,900,000

The Committee recommendation restores the House reduction for the working capital fund of the Bureau of Reclamation.

The funding request for fiscal year 1989 provides for necessary computer equipment upgrade to meet payroll, personnel and new accounting systems requirements.

TITLE III

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Funds recommended in the bill provide for Department of Energy programs relating to energy supply, research, and development activities including biological and environmental research, and basic energy sciences and supporting research and technical analysis; uranium supply and enrichment activities; general science and research activities; civilian nuclear waste fund; atomic energy defense activities; departmental administration; power marketing activities; the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission; and the geothermal resources development fund.

COORDINATION TO IMPROVE COMPETITIVENESS

The following statement on coordination to improve competition was approved by the Committee in action on the fiscal year 1988 appropriation bill (H.R. 2700, S. Rept. 100–159, p. 106) and is reaffirmed as a finding and recommendation again this year.

"The Committee recognizes that a critical component of the Nation's drive to improve its competitive posture in the world arena is a technologically oriented and educated population. The Department of Energy maintains our Nation's great scientific capability and has a major role to play in achieving these goals. The national laboratories are an invaluable resource of mathematical, scientific, and engineering expertise that should be tapped to promote joint scientific and technological ventures with industry and academia and to improve the education of America's youth. The Committee, therefore, urges the Department, and specifically the national laboratories, to actively seek areas of cooperation with the National Science Foundation and the Department of Education to coordinate and maximize the use of the Nation's research dollars, facilities, and manpower in such joint ventures."

In addition, the Department and the laboratories should take such steps as are necessary to improve the transfer of technology and the results of research and development to the marketplace. There is a general feeling that insufficient attention is being given to this matter and the Committee urges management to review the current framework, processes, and programs used for R&D laboratory technology transfer.

Energy Supply, Research, and Development Activities

OPERATING EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1988	$1,646,724,000
Budget estimate, 1989	[1] 1,820,296,000
House allowance	1,811,190,000
Committee recommendation	1,895,594,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+75,298,000
House allowance	+84,404,000

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

Appropriations, 1988	$341,633,000
Budget estimate, 1989	[1] 291,832,000
House allowance	261,432,000
Committee recommendation	312,832,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+21,000,000
House allowance	+51,400,000

[1] Includes funds budgeted under the proposed "Basic research user facilities" account.

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $2,208,426,000 for energy supply, research, and development activities. The purpose of these funds is to support the development of new energy technologies and improve the efficiency of existing technologies. Included are the development and demonstration of solar energy, wind, ocean systems, biomass, geothermal, nuclear fission and fusion, electric energy systems, and energy storage. Efforts associated with basic energy sciences and environmental and biological research are also included.

These programs address the development of longer term energy supply options to provide the energy resources needed for sustained national growth and to alleviate our dependence on fossil fuels and foreign oil.

SOLAR AND RENEWABLE ENERGY PROGRAMS

The President's budget proposes reductions of $16,477,000 from the previous year's level of funding for solar and renewable energy activities. This budget request would continue the downward trend in these programs which have been substantially curtailed over the last 8 years—from about $550,000,000 in 1981 to the fiscal year 1989 proposal of $80,400,000.

The Committee agrees that the marketplace must ultimately decide the future role of the solar technologies. Most solar and renewables research, however, has not been developed to the point where the private sector alone can be expected to carry forward with its development.

The Committee considers the continuation of activities in solar energy research and development to be a vital component in a balanced energy program. With a sustained commitment of the scientific and engineering talents in Government and private sector organizations, research progress can establish the knowledge and materials base required for the effective application of a new generation of solar technologies.

Accordingly, the Committee recommends program funds and staffing levels to assure progress in this research activity. The Committee recommendation for solar energy is $98,839,000, which is $18,464,000 above the budget.

Solar building systems.—The Committee recommends $5,365,000 for solar building energy systems, $35,000 below the level of operating expenses in the current year and the same as the House allowance.

The recommendation includes up to $750,000 to continue the ongoing Government-industry partnership effort to solve cooling and dehumidification problems in commercial and residential buildings in hot, humid climates.

Photovoltaic energy systems.—The recommendation includes $37,000,000 for photovoltaic energy systems, which is $2,000,000 above the 1988 level. This recommended funding will continue the highest priority requirements needed to continue progress in reducing costs and improving efficiencies of photovoltaic systems. Research must be maintained in high technology industries such as the photovoltaic industry if we are to remain competitive. In the last few years, the U.S. share of the international photovoltaics market fell from over 80 percent to nearly 50 percent. The Japanese market share almost doubled.

As in the past years, the Committee expects the Department to maintain a balanced program of advanced research, materials research, technology development, and systems development

The House allowance of $500,000 to continue the Southeast and Southwest Regional Experiment Station work with Sandia National Laboratories on test and evaluation of new single-junction and tandem thin-film modules is approved.

A report on the status and plans of the photovoltaic utility scale application [PVUSA] is to be provided by the Department prior to the fiscal year 1990 budget submission. The report is to include an assessment by the U.S. photovoltaic industry and manufacturers.

Solar thermal energy systems.—The Committee recommends $15,000,000 for solar thermal energy, the same as the budget request. The goal of this program is to advance the engineering and scientific understanding of solar thermal technology and to establish the technology base from which private industry can develop solar thermal production options for introduction into the energy market. These funds are to be applied to collection technology, energy conversion technology, and systems and application technology.

Again, the Committee directs the Department to report to the Committee, within 6 months, its activities and plans to bring the Department's research results to the marketplace. The commercialization strategy requested in the fiscal year 1988 appropriation action has yet to be received from the Department. A plan to transfer technology R&D to the U.S. utility sector including the goals for this program to integrate R&D with the private sector is to be included.

Biofuels energy systems.—The Committee recommends $17,000,000 for the biofuels program almost $6,000,000 over the budget request and $3,500,000 more than the House allowance.

The goal of this program is to conduct research that will provide the technology to increase the supply of domestically available feedstocks and convert those feedstocks plus wastes to liquid and gaseous fuels.

The Committee recommendation includes the House-passed allocation of $500,000 for the Hawaii biofuels program and $2,400,000 to continue the hydrogen production technology efforts in the amounts and at the same centers as approved for the current fiscal year.

Funding of $2,000,000 is allocated for the regional biofuels program which needs greater emphasis on transferring technologies to the private sector. Special research initiatives to assist industry in wood/coal cofiring, wood ash disposal, and combustion of unclean wood should be accomplished within the core research program.

The Committee has also approved an allocation of $1,300,000 to continue the methane from community waste project. This biomass conversion work, using anaerobic digestion as the conversion process, is cofunded by several organizations including universities and industry and is currently concentrating on municipal solid waste utilization.

Wind energy systems.—The recommendation provides $10,839,000 for wind energy systems, $2,000,000 more than the budget request and House allowance.

These additional funds are to be used to initiate a plan to help restore U.S. competitiveness in the wind energy market. A partnership initiative between the manufacturers and the Government is proposed which will advance and improve the state of the art of wind turbine technology.

Ocean energy systems.—The Committee provides $4,105,000 for ocean energy systems, the same as the House allowance. The objective of the Ocean Energy Program is to develop a generic technical data base and reduce the technical risks associated with the extraction and use of ocean-derived energy sources to the point that allows industry to judge where and when the technology could be commercialized. The recommendation provides $3,500,000 to be made available to PICHTR, an organization established by the State of Hawaii pursuant to section 3 of Act 152 of the 1983 Hawaii State legislative session, to continue work on the PICHTR–OTEC project.

Other solar programs.—The recommendation includes $9,530,000 for other solar activities. This amount includes funds for program direction and support, technology transfer activities; and $1,000,000 for the International Solar Energy Program to maintain industry export promotion programs mandated by the Committee on Renewable Energy, Commerce, and Trade [CORECT]. The CORECT activities are to be shared to a greater extent with the Department of Commerce International Trade Administration than currently is the case. No funds are provided for construction of the proposed, new Solar Energy Research Institute building.

GEOTHERMAL

The Geothermal Research and Development Program is aimed at resolving technical problems that preclude the private sector from fully developing our vast geothermal resources. The Committee recommends $19,556,000 for geothermal activities, an increase of $3,100,000 over the budget request and the same as House allowance.

Geothermal resources include steam, hot water, geopressured methane, hot dry rock, and magma. The geothermal energy research and development program is aimed at resolving the technical problems, which include uncertainties in determining size and life of reservoirs, unusually high drilling costs and lack of well stimulation techniques, the need for injection technology for economic disposal of spent brines, major corrosion and materials problems, environmental problems, and lack of efficient components.

The Committee recognizes the complex nature of the geothermal resource base and the need for developing improved analytical and testing capabilities. The Committee supports continuation of research activities to improve the tools and methods available for addressing the technical challenges associated with locating, evaluating, and extracting geothermal resources.

The recommendation includes $6,000,000 for geopressured resources, to continue the existing contract work in three field wells: Pleasant Bayou, Hulin, and Gladys McCall, to be used to resolve technical issues on production of hydrocarbons and brine and generation of electricity using the energy content of the produced fluids.

The budget request of $3,500,000 for the hot dry rock program is approved.

ELECTRIC ENERGY SYSTEMS AND STORAGE

The Committee recommends $36,259,000 for electric energy and electric energy systems storage.

The electric energy systems and storage program includes research in determining the effects of electric power transmission on humans and animals; development of technology for improving the reliability of the transmission and distribution of electricity; and research and development in systems technology and thermal and chemical storage.

The electric energy systems program is mainly applied research. That is, research to advance the state of the art in electric system concepts and technologies. This means that virtually all projects have a known objective or application, with the research carried to proof of concept and risks understood. Electric energy storage systems include battery, thermal and mechanical, and chemical storage.

Electric energy systems.—A total of $22,766,000 is provided for electric energy systems, which is $5,000,000 over the budget request and $1,000,000 more than the House allowance. The recommended amount includes $12,722,000 for materials research and continuing research and development of electric system applications of high temperature superconducting technology. An appropriation of $5,600,000 is provided to continue and complete the Hawaii deep water cable project.

Energy storage systems.—An amount of $13,493,000 is included for energy storage, an increase of $5,000,000 over the budget request. The recommendation includes $1,050,000 to continue work on the aluminum-air battery system, an additional $600,000 for the advanced near-term battery work, and $3,000,000 is recommended for a laboratory-industry initiative in electrochemical research and proton exchange membrane fuel cell technology. Also included is $3,600,000 for the technology base electrochemical energy storage research efforts managed and executed by the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory.

NUCLEAR ENERGY R&D PROGRAM

The Committee believes that nuclear fission remains an important option for meeting our electric energy requirements and maintaining a balanced national energy policy. The Committee continues to strongly support the need for a responsive nuclear fission program, but finds the current civilian nuclear power reactor program to be a deficient aggregate of numerous reactor types and conceptual variations being developed without the guidance of well-defined strategic objectives. The Committee finds further that the future development and institutionalization of nuclear power development should be rethought, newly defined, and directed to be responsive to current and projected conditions. Therefore, the Committee specifically provides $600,000 from funds made available in advanced R&D for a critical comparative analysis by the National Academy of Sciences of the practical technological and institutional options for future nuclear power development and for the formulation of coherent policy alternatives to guide the Nation's nuclear power development.

A total of $369,170,000 is provided for the nuclear energy research and development program, $46,000,000 above the House allowance and $17,300,000 above the budget request.

Light water reactors [LWR].—An amount of $26,800,000 is recommended for improved LWR technology, which is the same as the budget request and the House allowance.

Advanced reactor research and development.—The Committee recommends $89,500,000 for advanced reactor R&D, $16,000,000 more than the House allowance. The Committee agrees with the House action in providing additional funds for the high temperature gas reactor [HTGR] and includes $25,000,000 to continue the current program. An increase of $6,000,000 over the budget request is provided for the Argonne National Laboratory [ANL] in Idaho—$4,000,000 for modifications to the EBR II complex for the integral fast reactor fuel cycle process and $2,000,000 to support manufacture of metallic fuel for FFTF. In addition, $3,000,000 is for the Advanced Control Test Operation [ACTO] Program and $1,000,000 is for the shielding work, both activities at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory.

Space and defense power systems.—The Committee recommends $96,000,000 for space and defense power systems, $21,000,000 less than the budget request. This includes funds for the SP–100 program oper-

ating and capital expenses, for isotope power systems and for the multi-megawatt power systems, including continued development of thermionic technology. Consistent with reductions in the Department of Defense and Department of Energy strategic defense initiatives, this activity is reduced by $21,000,000.

The recommendation restores the general reduction of $20,000,000 agreed to by the House to provide additional funds for the solar and renewables program. The Committee recommends $5,000,000, the same as the budget, for the Thermionic Fuel Element [TFE] Verification Program.

Advanced nuclear systems.—The Committee recommends $27,700,000, the same as the House allowance and budget request. These funds are used to provide support for NASA missions.

Facilities.—The Committee is concerned that the Department has not provided sufficient resources to safely operate its test facilities. Also, adequate funding must be provided if the United States is to attract international partners in collaborative R&D programs. The Committee recommendation provides a total of $120,700,000 for the facilities account. This allowance is an increase of $10,000,000 over the budget request and House bill. The Committee understands that this increase is required for sustained key facility operations essential to continuing and broadening international collaboration opportunities. Therefore, $10,000,000 is provided for the Fast Flux Test Facility [FFTF] in Richland, WA. Of this amount, $8,000,000 is for fuel costs and $2,000,000 is for international collaborative programs. These funds will also enable DOE to pursue expanded collaboration in the areas of oxide fuel testing and steam generator testing.

REMEDIAL ACTIONS AND WASTE TECHNOLOGY

The total of $255,300,000 for remedial actions and waste technology activities is $5,000,000 less than the budget request and $10,000,000 less than the House.

For the uranium mill tailings remedial action program, the Committee has provided $111,000,000, and $47,200,000 is recommended for management of the surplus radioactivity contaminated facilities, both amounts the same as the budget request and the House allowance.

Byproducts program.—Over the past several years, the Department of Energy has been directed to support development of radioluminescent lighting for remote airfields. In fiscal year 1989, the Committee recommends that $570,000 be provided out of available funds for the continued support of radioluminescent light development. No additional funds are recommended for the food irradiation projects funded in the past few years.

ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY, AND HEALTH

The Committee recommends $98,000,000 for environment, safety, and health activities, an increase of $10,000,000 over the House allowance.

The Environment, Safety and Health [ES&H] Program was established to assure protection of the environment, safety of DOE workers and the public, and protection of DOE property. The ES&H Program implements these goals by defining DOE policy, providing guidance and technical assistance performing safety-related research of a generic nature and performing independent overview and assessment.

Carbon dioxide and the greenhouse effect linked to global change has become a national and international science and energy policy issue and is emerging as a major issue. The budget request contains additional funds in fiscal year 1989 for policy analysis, research, and joint model intercomparison, cloud and ocean research activities. Policy analysis activities are required to investigate the potential carbon dioxide reduction through energy strategic planning and to identify regions in jeopardy and potential effects on resources such as forests and agriculture. Work is proposed under this account as well as the Biological and Environmental Research Program in the Office of Energy Research.

The Committee has received several proposals, including specific requests from Members of the Senate, to have a thorough assessment and examination of options, studies, and policy analysis prepared on the global warming issue. The Committee agrees that this proposed work should be undertaken as a high priority and makes the following recommendations:

Of the $10,000,000 restored for the Environment, Safety, and Health Program, $3,000,000 is to be allocated to the Environmental Analysis activity of the program to carry out the following studies, and work to be coordinated with the Office of Energy Research (Biological and Environmental Research Programs):

Alternative energy research and development study.—The Secretary of Energy shall request that the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Engineering perform a review of the Federal Government's alternative energy research and development program. The review should: (*a*) assess the current state of research and development activities in alternative energy sources (including, but not limited to, nuclear power, solar power, renewable energy sources, improved methods of employing fossil fuels, energy conservation, and energy efficiency) within the Federal Government and private sector; and (*b*) suggest appropriate research and development strategies for alternative energy sources with particular emphasis on the potential of such strategies to stabilize the concentrations of the gases that contribute to global climate change. In addition, the review should analyze under what circumstances, and determine those technologies for which, additional Federal investment would encourage greater private investment in alternative sources of energy. The Committee requests that this review be completed in 9 months.

Carbon dioxide inventory and policy study.—The Secretary of Energy shall prepare a report for Congress that comprehensively inventories the sources of carbon dioxide (CO_2) in the United States and analyzes the policy options to be formulated in cooperation with the Environmental

Protection Agency (including, but not limited to, energy pricing, energy efficiency requirements, alternative fuels, alternative end use, and supply technology) which would lead to a 20-percent reduction in domestic CO_2 emissions in the short run (5 to 10 years) and a 50-percent emissions reduction in the long run (15 to 20 years). This work should be completed within 12 months.

Greenhouse gas data collection study.—The Secretary of Energy shall prepare a study for Congress of the Federal Government's existing data about the sources and trends of greenhouse gas emissions and the trends toward climatic change. The study should include a review of the Federal Government's current sources of data and how that data is coordinated, archived, and made accessible to governmental and nongovernmental scientists. In addition, the study should recommend policy options that will improve coordination of the Federal Government's collection and dissemination of data concerning trends in greenhouse gas emissions and climatic change. This study is requested within 6 months.

Study of options to mobilize the private sector.—The Secretary of Energy shall prepare a study for Congress of policy options that will encourage the private sector to cooperate in mitigating, adapting, and preventing global climate change. The study should suggest strategies that will mobilize the resources of the private sector toward addressing the issue of global climate change. This should be completed within 6 months.

LIQUEFIED GASEOUS FUELS SPILL TEST FACILITY

The Committee recommends $1,500,000 to continue baseline operations support and for facility maintenance, research and development, and technical interaction with potential sponsors of research.

BIOLOGICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH

The Committee recommends $264,000,000 for biological and environmental research, $15,000,000 over the budget request.

This program has two main objectives: (1) To develop the knowledge base necessary to identify, understand, and anticipate the long-term health and environmental consequences of energy use and development; and (2) to utilize the Department's unique scientific and technological capabilities to solve major scientific problems in medicine and biology.

Human genome project.—The Committee agrees with these observations contained in the House Committee report in support of the Department of Energy's leading role in the human genome project. "The Department's historical strengths in technology development and the management of multidisciplinary scientific projects make it uniquely qualified to take a leading role in the effort to map and eventually sequence the human genome. The fiscal year 1989 budget request for this project is reasonable and should enable the project to accomplish its initial goals. The Committee believes Federal research associated with this project should be centrally coordinated by the Department and that the

Department should increase both the responsibility and funding for the human genome centers established at its national laboratories."

Nuclear medicine program.—This Committee also concurs with the House Committee's views in support of the Department of Energy's Nuclear Medicine Research Program, which has yielded a significant return on investment in terms of vastly improved diagnostic and therapeutic technologies that are rapidly transferred to the clinical setting. These advances not only improve the quality of medical care for millions of people across the country, but they also reduce total U.S. health care expenditures by reducing hospitalization time, improving the diagnostic process, and often obviating the need for more costly, more invasive therapies such as cardiac catheterization and bypass surgery.

The Committee recognizes that the Nuclear Medicine Research Program has produced remarkable technological breakthroughs with a relatively small budget. Because of the cost effectiveness this program has demonstrated, and because of the static funding levels of this program for the past 5 years, the Committee recommends an increase of $3,000,000 in fiscal year 1989 for nuclear medicine research operating expenses and an additional $2,500,000 to be derived from within available funds for a total of $40,000,000.

The Committee is deeply concerned over internal programmatic reallocations of funds within the Department which have resulted in reductions in the nuclear medicine research budget in order to support shortfalls in other programs outside of this account. Because of the negative impact such reallocations have on the Nuclear Medicine Research Program, and because this program has been underfunded in the past, the Committee directs that nuclear medicine research operating funds be protected from such reallocations and that no reductions be made from the recommended fiscal year 1989 appropriation.

Boron neutron capture therapy.—In accordance with the Boron Neutron Capture Therapy/Idaho National Engineering Laboratory report from the National Cancer Institute, the Department of Energy is directed to provide the necessary funding to the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory for those elements of the program endorsed by the National Cancer Institute committee, to keep the reactor in standby, and to develop a broadened program that includes research in melanoma.

Construction.—The Committee recommendation includes $12,000,000 for continuation and completion of the Federal commitment to project 88-R-124, to expand and consolidate basic research facilities at the Oregon Health Sciences University including planning, design, construction, and equipment acquisition. The continued modernization will allow the nursing departments and research programs to be relocated to the Health Sciences Building thereby providing additional space for basic science research. The project will employ energy management and heat recovery systems within the highly computerized academic health sciences building. It is the Committee's understanding that non-Federal

PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED THROUGH FY 1988	FY 1989 BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
LOAN PROGRAM					
ARIZONA					
GILA RIVER FARMS SUPPLEMENTAL	6,55[illegible],000	4,502,000	1,691,000	1,691,000	1,291,000
CALIFORNIA					
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY-DAY CREEK PROJECT	13,412,000	---	---	3,000,000	3,000,000
ELSINORE VALLEY IRRIGATION DISTRICT	25,975,000	4,529,000	10,625,000	10,625,000	10,625,000
RANCHO CALIFORNIA WATER DISTRICT	20,268,000	14,836,000	5,450,000	5,450,000	2,850,000
UNITED WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT	18,156,000	---	---	5,000,000	5,000,000
COLORADO					
STAGECOACH	7,037,000	---	---	2,000,000	2,000,000
TEXAS					
HIDALGO COUNTY IRRIGATION DISTRICT NO. 1 SUPPL	12,972,000	---	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
VARIOUS					
ADMINISTRATION OF THE LOAN PROGRAM	15,069,000	10,364,000	820,000	820,000	820,000
UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION BASED ON ANTICIPATED DELAYS	---	---	-1,564,000	-1,564,000	-1,564,000
TOTAL, LOAN PROGRAM			19,022,000	29,022,000	26,022,000

contributions will be committed to the project and no continuing operating funds will be requested or required to support the facility.

The recommendation also includes $8,000,000 to continue and complete project 88–R–123 Cancer Research Center, Medical University of South Carolina. This model cancer research center will carry on research activities based on research in nuclear medicine radiation therapy, and gene mapping. It is the Committee's understanding that substantial non-Federal contributions will be committed to the project, and that no continuing operating funds will be requested or required to support the facility.

MAGNETIC FUSION

The recommendation would provide $356,000,000 for the Magnetic Fusion Energy Research Program. This amount is $4,000,000 less than the budget request and $13,000,000 more than the House allowance.

The goal of this program is to establish the scientific and technological base required for achieving magnetic fusion energy. The program is being conducted according to the Magnetic Fusion Program plan [MFPP], which was developed in 1985. In this plan, the target for completion of magnetic fusion development is determined by the present technical, economic, and political uncertainties of energy supply. Given time scales for the resolution of these uncertainties, it follows that the scientific and technological base for fusion should be essentially available by the turn of the century.

The strategy for providing the scientific and technological base is twofold: (1) maintenance of a strong, domestic R&D program to adequately cover the necessary range of fusion science and technology used, and (2) use of international collaboration to advance the program in a timely way.

Impressive progress continues in establishing the scientific feasibility of magnetic fusion energy. Because of uncertainties in the long-term energy supply, it is important to maintain steady progress toward the realization of fusion energy. The Committee has, therefore, long been supportive of the fusion program and believes it is important for the Government to support the program through the present research phase until a definitive engineering and economic assessment can be performed.

The Committee has restored the $5,000,000 reduction made by the House in operating expenses and has approved an allocation of $8,000,000 to continue research development and planning work for Project 88–R–902, Compact Ignition Tokamak [CIT] (AE&D only). No funds are provided for construction in fiscal year 1989. The Committee intends to make a full and extensive review of the Magnetic Fusion Program, focusing particularly on the CIT project and the Department's plans for proceeding with this project. Arrangements for further international collaboration and identifying issues that may pose obstacles to such collaboration are matters that need to be explored in this review. Further, it may be desirable to propose new legislation which would es-

tablish a sound basis for the future efforts in the scientific and technological quest for magnetic fusion energy.

SUPPORTING RESEARCH AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS

The budget request proposes $611,814,000 for supporting research and technical analysis including basic energy sciences, multiprogram facility support, oversight, analysis, and university support. The Committee provides $664,514,000 for these activities, an increase of $52,700,000 over the budget request and $53,985,000 above the House. These amounts include funding proposed in the budget under a new Basic Research User Facilities Program appropriation account.

Basic energy sciences.—A total of $569,730,000 is recommended for basic energy sciences, an increase of $51,700,000 above the budget request and $52,985,000 above the House allowance, as shown in the following programs and activities. To insure that the minimum level of effort continues, the Committee has provided additional funding in each program or activity where appropriate.

Materials science.—The Committee has restored the $5,000,000 reduction proposed by the House. The recommendation includes the increase of $7,000,000 proposed in the budget for expanded research in high temperature superconductivity, combustion and catalysis, oil- and gas-rlated research, and high performance materials. An additional amount of $5,000,000 is provided for high temperature diagnostic instrumentation and analysis.

The Committee has approved the budget request for the 6–7GeV Advanced Photon Source at Argonne National Laboratory. Only continued research and development, engineering, and design and other necessary preliminary work will continue in fiscal year 1989 but no actual construction funding is proposed or approved. This advanced facility will be a crucial tool in maintaining U.S. international competitiveness in industrial research, basic sciences research, defense-related research, and in a wide variety of applications including medical diagnosis.

The Committee recommends an additional $5,000,000 which, together with the $3,700,000 proposed in the budget, will provide for a total of $8,700,000 in fiscal year 1989 to continue research and development and preliminary engineering work leading to an Advanced Neutron Source at Oak Ridge National Laboratory. No construction funding is proposed or approved.

An additional $1,700,000 is approved for operating expenses for user program and commissioning of the Proton Storage Ring at Los Alamos Neutron Scattering Center [LANSCE]. This provides a total of $3,100,000 million in fiscal year 1989. Additional funds for the upgrade will be required in fiscal year 1990.

The Committee recognizes the increasing importance of materials processing research as a part of the research process to develop and commercialize new advanced materials. The Department has an important role in this area with its major materials processing research centers

at the Ames Laboratory and Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory. To enhance materials processing research effort the Department and its research laboratories the Committee has allocated an additional $5,000,000 for expanded research in this area in fiscal year 1989. It is expected that new research projects will be initiated with these additional funds, especially projects which focus on new technologies for the discovery, design, and development of new processes for producing exotic and specialty metals. It is expected that the Department will begin planning for the development of a center for material processing in this area.

Energy biosciences.—The Committee has provided $700,000 to continue the industrial biotechnology research program at the Oregon Graduate Center and $500,000 to continue a research effort in membrane-based technologies at the center.

Facilities.—The Committee allowance provides for the continuation and completion of Project 88–R–404, Center for Advanced Microstructures and Devices, Louisiana State University, and Project 87–R–411, Barry Goldwater Center for Science and Engineering, Arizona State University. Both projects were initiated in prior fiscal years.

Cooperative and other programs.—Since 1981, the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, the Ana G. Mendez Education Foundation, and Jackson State University have had a cooperative arrangement designed to enhance computer science and scientific research at all three institutions. This consortium has had a major impact on the development of minority science faculty, who are making significant contributions in teaching and research. The Committee directs the Department to provide $2,000,000 in fiscal year 1989 to maintain and support this effort.

From within funds made available in basic energy sciences and not otherwise discussed in this report, $11,900,000 is to be made available to continue the cooperative agreement between the Department of Energy and the Supercomputer Computations Research Institute [SCRI] located at Florida State University. Funding has been approved since fiscal year 1985 as part of a 5-year agreement by the Department.

University research support.—The Committee recommendation provides $5,000,000, the same amount appropriated in fiscal year 1988, to be made available, on a competitive basis, to university nuclear engineering programs. These moneys are to be made available for graduate fellowships, direct research support, and educational support programs in the field of nuclear engineering.

The budget request of $2,100,000 for university research reactors fuel assistance includes funds for refueling for four reactors, two with low enriched uranium fuel [LEU], and continues support for LEU conversion as mandated by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. The Committee has approved the full amount requested.

Multiprogram facilities.—The recommendation includes $61,875,000 for multiprogram lab facilities support, $4,000,000 less than the budget request. The Committee has restored $6,000,000 of the $10,000,000 general reduction which was made by the House for multiprogram general purpose facilities.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY

The following tabulation shows the Committee's recommendation by program for new budget authority in comparison with the current year, the budget estimate, and the House allowance:

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
ENERGY SUPPLY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT				
SOLAR ENERGY				
I. Solar applications				
A. Solar building energy systems				
Operating expenses	5,250	5,365	5,365	5,365
Capital equipment	150	---	---	---
Subtotal, Solar building energy systems	5,400	5,365	5,365	5,365
B. Photovoltaic energy systems				
Operating expenses	34,700	23,380	23,380	36,200
Capital equipment	300	800	800	800
Subtotal, Photovoltaic energy systems	35,000	24,180	24,180	37,000

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
C. Solar thermal energy systems				
Operating expenses	16,950	14,700	14,700	14,700
Capital equipment	88	300	300	300
Subtotal, Solar thermal energy system	17,038	15,000	15,000	15,000
D. Biofuels energy systems				
Operating expenses	17,055	10,480	12,880	16,445
Capital equipment	---	555	555	555
Subtotal, Biofuels energy systems	17,055	11,035	13,435	17,000
E. Wind energy systems				
Operating expenses	8,140	8,339	8,339	10,339
Capital equipment	400	500	500	500
Mod 5-B	---	---	---	---
Subtotal, Wind energy systems	8,540	8,839	8,839	10,839

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
F. Ocean energy systems				
Operating expenses	4,000	3,105	4,105	4,105
Subtotal, Solar applications	87,033	67,524	70,924	89,309
II. Other solar energy				
A. International solar energy program - OE	750	541	1,000	1,000
B. Solar technology transfer				
Operating expenses	2,590	1,780	2,400	2,000
Capital equipment	---	---	---	---
C. Solar Energy Research Institute				
Capital equipment	380	392	392	392
Construction:				
General plant projects	240	250	250	250

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
89-C-700 Solar energy research facility (SERF	---	4,000	---	---
Subtotal, Solar Energy Research Institute.....	620	4,642	642	642
D. Resource assessment				
Operating expenses.....	700	709	709	709
Capital equipment.....	28	45	45	45
Subtotal, Resource assessment.....	728	754	754	754
E. Program support - OE.....	937	970	970	970
F. Program direction - OE.....	4,194	4,164	4,164	4,164
Subtotal, Other solar energy.....	9,819	12,851	9,930	9,530
General increase.....	---	---	20,000	---
TOTAL, SOLAR ENERGY.....	96,852	80,375	100,854	98,839

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
(Operating expenses)	(95,266)	(73,533)	(98,012)	(95,997)
(Capital equipment)	(1,346)	(2,592)	(2,592)	(2,592)
(Construction)	(240)	(4,250)	(250)	(250)
GEOTHERMAL				
I. Hydrothermal industrialization				
Operating expenses	500	---	---	---
II. Geopressured resources				
Operating expenses	5,000	2,900	6,000	6,000
III. Geothermal technology development				
Operating expenses	14,600	11,935	11,935	11,935
Capital equipment	---	795	795	795
Subtotal, Geothermal technology development	14,600	12,730	12,730	12,730

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
IV. Program direction - OE	835	826	826	826
TOTAL, GEOTHERMAL	20,935	16,456	19,556	19,556
(Operating expenses)	(20,935)	(15,661)	(18,761)	(18,761)
(Capital equipment)	---	(795)	(795)	(795)
I. Small scale hydropower development - OE	---	---	---	---
II. Program direction - OE	---	---	---	---
ELECTRIC ENERGY SYSTEMS AND STORAGE				
I. Electric energy systems				
A. Electric field effects research				
Operating expenses	2,200	2,200	4,000	2,200

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
B. Reliability research				
Operating expenses	1,817	2,494	2,494	2,494
C. System technology				
Operating expenses	10,920	12,722	16,722	17,722
D. Program direction - OE	333	350	350	350
Subtotal, Electric energy systems	15,270	17,766	23,566	22,766
(Operating expenses)	(15,270)	(17,766)	(23,566)	(22,766)
II. Energy Storage Systems				
A. Battery storage				
Operating expenses	10,269	6,671	9,671	9,671

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Capital equipment	26	27	27	27
Subtotal, Battery storage	10,295	6,698	9,698	9,698
B. Thermal and mechanical storage				
Operating expenses	3,800	1,400	3,400	3,400
C. Program direction - OE	405	395	395	395
Subtotal, Energy storage systems	14,500	8,493	13,493	13,493
TOTAL, ELECTRIC ENERGY SYSTEMS AND STORAGE	29,770	26,259	37,059	36,259
(Operating expenses)	(29,744)	(26,232)	(37,032)	(36,232)
(Capital equipment)	(26)	(27)	(27)	(27)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
NUCLEAR				
I. Nuclear Energy R&D				
A. Light water reactor				
Operating expense	32,000	26,800	26,800	26,800
B. Advanced reactor R & D				
Operating expense	89,070	60,200	72,500	88,500
Capital equipment	3,500	1,000	1,000	1,000
Subtotal, Advanced reactor R & D	92,570	61,200	73,500	89,500
C. Space & defense power systems				
Operating expense	63,460	75,490	64,490	64,490
Capital equipment	3,470	12,850	7,850	7,850

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Construction:				
89-N-111 Dips	---	7,500	2,500	2,500
86-N-105 SP-100 fac. mods - HEDL	8,320	21,160	21,160	21,160
Subtotal, construction	8,320	28,660	23,660	23,660
General reduction	---	---	-20,000	---
Subtotal, Space & defense power systems	75,250	117,000	76,000	96,000
D. Advanced nuclear systems				
Operating expense	19,800	24,700	24,700	24,700
Capital equipment	1,200	3,000	3,000	3,000
Subtotal, Advanced nuclear systems	21,000	27,700	27,700	27,700

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
E. Facilities				
Operating expense	105,900	96,900	96,900	106,900
Capital equipment	3,500	4,600	4,600	4,600
Construction:				
89-N-112 Mods to reactors	4,500	3,400	3,400	3,400
89-N-113 GPP	---	3,800	3,800	3,800
89-N-115 Fire suf. imp., ANL	---	2,000	2,000	2,000
88-N-102 GPP	3,800	---	---	---
85-N-602 ANAL, INEL, ID, security upgrades	---	---	---	---
Subtotal, construction	8,300	9,200	9,200	9,200
Subtotal, Facilities	117,700	110,700	110,700	120,700

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Operating expense	---	---	---	---
G. Program direction - OE	8,500	8,470	8,470	8,470
Subtotal, Nuclear Energy R & D	347,020	351,870	323,170	369,170
(Operating expense)	(318,730)	(292,560)	(273,860)	(319,860)
(Capital equipment)	(11,670)	(21,450)	(16,450)	(16,450)
(Construction)	(16,620)	(37,860)	(32,860)	(32,860)
II. Remedial actions & Waste technology				
A. Formerly utilized sites remedial action program				
Operating expenses	22,800	22,400	22,400	22,400
Capital equipment	200	200	200	200
Subtotal, Formerly utilized sites remedial action program	23,000	22,600	22,600	22,600

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
B. Grand Junction remedial action OE.....	---	---	---	---
C. Uranium program mill tailings remedial action program				
Operating expenses.....	111,000	113,400	113,400	108,400
Capital equipment.....	250	2,600	2,600	2,600
Subtotal, Uranium program mill tailings remedial action program.....	111,250	116,000	116,000	111,000
D. Surplus facilities				
Operating expenses.....	45,700	46,900	46,900	46,900
Capital equipment.....	300	300	300	300
Subtotal, Management of surplus radioactivity contaminated DOE facilities.....	46,000	47,200	47,200	47,200

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
E. West Valley				
Operating expenses.....	54,200	67,100	67,100	67,100
F. Low level waste				
Operating expenses.....	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000
G. Waste technology & Byproducts				
Operating expenses.....	5,000	---	5,000	---
H. Program direction - OE.....	2,300	2,400	2,400	2,400
Subtotal, Remedial actions & Waste technology....	246,750	260,300	265,300	255,300
III. Civilian waste R&D				
A. Spent Fuel Storage R & D				
Operating expenses.....	4,800	2,300	2,300	2,300

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
B. Program direction	200	198	198	198
Subtotal, Civilian waste R&D	5,000	2,498	2,498	2,498
TOTAL, NUCLEAR	598,770	614,668	590,968	626,968
(Operating expenses)	(569,730)	(552,258)	(538,558)	(574,558)
(Capital equipment)	(12,420)	(24,550)	(19,550)	(19,550)
(Construction)	(16,620)	(37,860)	(32,860)	(32,860)
ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH				
I. Environment, safety and health				
Operating expenses	65,900	106,900	84,900	94,900
Capital equipment	2,100	3,100	3,100	3,100
TOTAL, ENVIRONMENT SAFETY AND HEALTH	68,000	110,000	88,000	98,000

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
LIQUIFIED GASEOUS SPILL TEST FACILITY				
I. Spill test facility				
Operating expenses	1,000	766	866	1,500
ENVIRONMENT R & D				
I. Biological and Environmental Research				
Operating expenses	201,500	232,500	222,500	227,500
Capital equipment	8,500	9,000	9,000	9,000
Construction:				
89-R-120 General plant projects various locations	---	3,500	3,500	3,500
88-R-120 General plant projects, various locations	3,000	---	---	---

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
88-R-121 Inst-Human Genomic Studies, NYC.....	12,700	---	---	---
88-R-122 Pediatric Research Center at Childrens Hospital, PA.....	15,000	---	---	---
88-R-123 Cancer Res. Ctr., Univ. of SC.....	8,000	---	---	8,000
88-R-124 Oregon Health Science Univ., OR.....	10,000	---	---	12,000
87-R-130 Inst. of nuc. med., N.J.....	7,500	---	---	---
86-R-120 GPP.....	---	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction.....	56,200	3,500	3,500	23,500
Subtotal, Biological and environ. research.....	266,200	245,000	235,000	260,000
II. Program direction - OE.....				

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
A. Bio and env. research - PD.....	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000
Total, Biological and environmental research.....	270,200	249,000	239,000	264,000
(Operating expenses).....	(205,500)	(236,500)	(226,500)	(231,500)
(Capital equipment).....	(8,500)	(9,000)	(9,000)	(9,000)
(Construction).....	(56,200)	(3,500)	(3,500)	(23,500)
FUSION				
I. Magnetic fusion				
A. Confinement systems				
Operating expenses.....	158,620	175,565	170,565	175,565
B. Development and technology				
Operating expenses.....	55,915	54,145	54,145	54,145

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
C. Applied plasma physics				
Operating expenses	74,775	78,155	78,155	78,155
D. Planning and projects				
Operating expenses	4,520	5,000	5,000	5,000
E. Program direction - OE	4,600	4,600	4,600	4,600
F. Capital equipment	19,670	21,635	21,635	21,635
G. Construction				
89-R-900 GPP	---	8,900	8,900	8,900
88-R-900 General plant projects, various locations	8,900	---	---	---
88-R-902 Compact ignition tokamak, PPPL, Princeton, NJ	8,000	12,000	---	8,000

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
87-R-900 General plant projects, various locations	---	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	16,900	20,900	8,900	16,900
Total, Fusion	335,000	360,000	343,000	356,000
(Operating expenses)	(298,430)	(317,465)	(312,465)	(317,465)
(Capital equipment)	(19,670)	(21,635)	(21,635)	(21,635)
(Construction)	(16,900)	(20,900)	(8,900)	(16,900)
SUPPORTING RESEARCH AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS				
I. Basic energy sciences				
A. Materials sciences				
Operating expenses	172,491	179,046	174,046	195,746

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
B. Chemical sciences				
Operating expenses	130,603	136,878	134,993	138,878
C. Applied mathematical sciences				
Operating expenses	42,450	42,970	42,970	46,970
D. Engineering and geosciences				
Operating expenses	31,350	33,413	33,413	35,413
E. Advanced energy projects				
Operating expenses	14,300	14,643	14,643	16,643
F. Energy biosciences				
Operating expenses	20,250	20,780	20,780	22,780
G. Program direction - OE	4,500	4,900	4,900	4,900

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
H. Capital equipment	31,699	31,700	31,700	31,700
I. Construction				
89-R-401 AIP	---	2,300	2,300	2,300
89-R-400 GPP	---	4,900	4,900	4,900
89-R-601 6-7 GeV	---	6,000	---	6,000
88-R-400 General plant projects, various locations	4,900	---	---	---
88-R-401 AIP	2,300	---	---	---
88-R-403 3 GeV spear injector, SSRL	3,000	6,500	6,500	6,500
88-R-404 Ctr. for Advanced Microstructure & Devices, Louisiana State University	12,000	---	---	13,000

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
88-R-405 Ctr. for Applied Optics, Univ of Alabama	10,600	---	---	---
88-R-406 Ctr. for Automated Technology DREXEL	6,500	---	5,500	---
88-R-407 Inst. for Adv. Physics, University of Boston	8,500	---	---	---
88-R-408 Multi-Purp. Ctr., Boston College	4,000	---	---	---
88-R-409 Proton Beam Cancer Treatment, Loma Linda Med'l Ctr., CA	8,500	---	11,100	---
88-R-410 Ctr for Physical & Env. Science, East Ctrl, Univ., OK	4,000	---	---	---
locations	---	---	---	---
ments and modifications, various locations	---	---	---	---
87-R-403 Neutron Scattering Hall	8,500	4,000	4,000	4,000

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
87-R-405 Combustion research facility, Phase II, Sandia National Laboratories, Livermore, California	4,500	---	---	---
87-R-406 1-2 GEV, LBL	18,000	30,000	25,000	30,000
87-R-407 Ctr. for new industrial materials Iowa, State University	---	---	---	---
87-R-408 Energy res. complex, University of South Carolina	---	---	---	---
87-R-409 Ctr. for nuc imag res-U of Ala	---	---	---	---
87-R-410 St. Christopher's Hospital for Children, Energy demonstration proj	---	---	---	---
87-R-411 Barry Goldwater Ctr. for Science & Engineering, Arizona State	10,000	---	---	10,000
86-R-300 Atlanta University	---	---	---	---

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
85-E-500 Demonstr ctr for info tech-Brown...	---	---	---	---
85-ER-133 U of Oregon Science Fac.....	---	---	---	---
85-ER-403 Kansas State University.....	---	---	---	---
84-ER-112 Center for advanced material.....	7,632	---	---	---
84-ER-115 Nat'l center for chemical research	4,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction.....	116,932	53,700	59,300	76,700
Subtotal, Basic energy sciences.....	564,575	518,030	516,745	569,730
(Operating expenses).....	(415,944)	(432,630)	(425,745)	(461,330)
(Capital equipment).....	(31,699)	(31,700)	(31,700)	(31,700)
(Construction).....	(116,932)	(53,700)	(59,300)	(76,700)

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
II. Energy oversight, research analy. & Univ support				
A. Energy research analysis - OE.....	3,700	3,800	3,800	3,800
B. University research support - OE				
Operating expenses:				
1. University reactor fuel assistance.....	1,900	2,100	2,100	2,100
2. Laboratory Coop Science Education Ctrs...	13,800	9,500	19,500	14,500
3. Energy manpower development program.....	1,700	2,770	2,770	2,770
4. R&D Laboratory Tech Transfer.....	1,000	1,400	1,400	1,400
Subtotal, University research support.....	18,400	15,770	25,770	20,770
C. Advisory and oversight - OE.....	3,200	3,339	3,339	3,339
D. University research instrumentation.....	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000
Subtotal, Energy oversight, res analy, & Univ sup	30,300	27,909	37,909	32,909
(Operating expenses).....	(30,300)	(27,909)	(37,909)	(32,909)

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
III. Multiple Energy Laboratories - Fac. Sup.				
A. Multiprogram general purpose facilities Construction:				
89-R-113 Environmental Upgrades (BNL).....	---	1,500	1,500	1,500
89-R-112 Replace PCB Transformer (ANL).....	---	1,000	1,000	1,000
89-R-111 Building utilities, PNL.....	---	668	668	668
89-R-110 Elec. Syst. Upgrade, ORNL.....	---	854	854	854
89-R-109 Measurements and Controls Support Facility, ORNL.....	---	1,100	1,100	1,100
89-R-108 Roads & Parking Rehab., ORNL.....	---	2,520	2,520	2,520
89-R-107 Labsite Substation Rehab., LBL.....	---	250	250	250
89-R-106 Instrument Support Lab., LBL.....	---	200	200	200

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
89-R-105 Building Addition, BNL.....	---	1,625	1,625	1,625
89-R-104 Cosmotron Bldg. Rehab, BNL.....	---	300	300	300
89-R-103 Boiler Replacement, BNL.....	---	409	409	409
89-R-102 Fire Protection III, BNL.....	---	645	645	645
89-R-101 Rehab Fire, Water, Pumping & Storage Systems, ANL.....	---	150	150	150
89-R-100 Trans. Fac. Replacement, ANL.....	---	350	350	350
88-R-802 Lab building revitalization, BNL....	455	1,445	1,445	1,445
88-R-804 Piping system upgrade, ORNL.....	520	1,330	1,330	1,330
88-R-805 Environmental improvements, BNL.....	565	1,946	1,946	1,946
88-R-806 Environmental health & safety project, LBL.....	850	3,448	3,448	3,448

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
88-R-807 Electrical system rehab, ANL.....	350	2,150	2,150	2,150
88-R-809 Plant mods to comply with EPA requirements, ANL.....	820	1,000	1,000	1,000
88-R-812 Hazardous waste handling fac, LBL...	500	3,950	3,950	3,950
88-R-814 Sewage treatment sys. upgrade, PNL..	940	2,060	2,060	2,060
88-R-817 Upgrade fire protection, ORNL.....	770	980	980	980
87-R-751 Laboratory Restoration I, PNL.....	---	---	---	---
87-R-752 Piping System Restoration, ORNL.....	2,475	600	600	600
87-R-753 Rehabilitate Laboratory Space (Building 200), ANL.....	3,600	3,600	3,600	3,600
87-R-755 Mechanical Systems Rehab., ANL.....	2,100	500	500	500
87-R-756 Waterline Replacement, ANL.....	1,500	3,134	3,134	3,134

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
87-R-757 Electrical System Rehab., LBL.....	1,840	460	460	460
87-R-758 Rehab. Mechanical Utilities, LBL....	3,000	1,585	1,585	1,585
87-R-759 Upgrade Steam Dist. System, ORNL....	5,472	---	---	---
86-R-726 Fire protection improvements (BNL)..	375	464	464	464
85-R-701 Central chilled water facility (BNL)	268	---	---	---
85-R-702 Replace laboratory roofs (ANL).....	267	---	---	---
85-R-703 Elect dist system restor (ORNL).....	---	---	---	---
85-R-706 Medical facility (LLNL).....	150	312	312	312
85-R-707 Hanford site fire alarm sys. upgrade	575	375	375	375
85-R-709 Central chilled water plant (ANL)...	638	---	---	---

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
85-R-712 Central chilled water system rest...	---	---	---	---
84-ER-103 Road repair (various locations)....	470	490	490	490
Subtotal, Construction.....	28,500	41,400	41,400	41,400
General reduction.....	---	---	-10,000	-4,000
Subtotal, Multi-program facilities.....	28,500	41,400	31,400	37,400
(Construction).....	(28,500)	(41,400)	(31,400)	(37,400)
B. Environmental compliance				
Operating expenses.....	12,900	8,770	8,770	8,770
Capital Equipment.....	400	305	305	305
Construction:				
89-R-770 General Plant Projects.....	---	2,500	2,500	2,500

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
88-R-830 Liquid low level waste collection and transfer sys upgrade, ORNL.....	4,800	11,787	11,787	11,787
87-R-770 General plant projects (ORNL).....	---	---	---	---
86-R-801 Nonradiological process waste treat	7,000	1,113	1,113	1,113
Subtotal, Construction.....	11,800	15,400	15,400	15,400
Subtotal, Environmental Compliance Program	25,100	24,475	24,475	24,475
Total, Multiprogram Laboratories Facilities Suppo	53,600	65,875	55,875	61,875
(Operating expenses).....	(12,900)	(8,770)	(8,770)	(8,770)
(Capital equipment).....	(400)	(305)	(305)	(305)
(Construction).....	(40,300)	(56,800)	(46,800)	(52,800)

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
IV. Small business innovation research program.....	---	---	---	---
Total, Supporting research and tech. analysis....	648,475	611,814	610,529	664,514
(Operating expenses).....	(459,144)	(469,309)	(472,424)	(503,009)
(Capital equipment).....	(32,099)	(32,005)	(32,005)	(32,005)
(Construction).....	(157,232)	(110,500)	(106,100)	(129,500)
POLICY AND MANAGEMENT				
I. Policy and Management				
A. Policy and management - ER.....	650	667	667	667
B. Policy and management - NE.....	2,200	2,165	2,165	2,165
C. Policy and management - CE.....	1,450	1,763	1,763	1,763
Subtotal, Policy and management.....	4,300	4,595	4,595	4,595

ISOTOPE PRODUCTION AND DISTRIBUTION FUND

Appropriation, 1988	
Budget estimate, 1989	$16,243,000
House allowance	
Committee recommendation	
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−16,243,000
House allowance	

This is a new account proposed by the administration this year for activities historically funded in the "Departmental administration" account and in the "Energy supply, research, and development" account. The Committee concurs with the House and rejects this proposed account structure and choses to continue to use the same structure as in fiscal year 1988. Accordingly, the Committee's recommendations for activities proposed in the isotope production and distribution fund are included in the "Departmental administration" and "Energy supply, research, and development" accounts.

The administration has proposed to establish the isotope production and distribution fund in order to bring together the various funding for isotope production into a single account. It is proposed that this appropriation treatment will improve the management of the activity and contribute to a more business-like approach.

The Committee agrees with the views contained in the House report and bill as follows: "The Committee shares the concern of the administration that the management of this activity has not been satisfactory. The Department produces isotopes that are key to a number of U.S. industries including the multimillion dollar nuclear medicine industry. The Department of Energy inspector general has criticized the Department's management of this program.

The Committee does not agree that the establishment of a financially intricate revolving fund is required to improve the management of the enterprise. The Department has not established the responsibility for the management of this effort. The production of isotopes is managed by four headquarters and seven field office organizations. The operation is basically not managed by any organization but rather is a minor portion of various organization responsibilities."

The Committee does not agree with the House Committee direction to the Department to locate within the Office of Energy Research an office dedicated to coordinating and managing the Department's isotope production activities. Instead, the recommendation is for the Department to examine the various alternatives for best managing this activity and provide to the House and Senate Committees its views and recommendations concerning this important responsibility.

URANIUM SUPPLY AND ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES

GROSS APPROPRIATIONS

Appropriations, 1988	$950,000,000
Budget estimate, 1989	1,184,000,000
House allowance	1,133,080,000
Committee recommendation	1,181,600,000
Comparison	
Budget estimate	−2,400,000
House allowance	+48,520,000

REVENUES

Appropriations, 1988	−$1,301,000,000
Budget estimate, 1989	−1,276,000,000
House allowance	−1,276,000,000
Committee recommendation	−1,276,000,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 1988	−$351,000,000
Budget estimate, 1989	−92,000,000
House allowance	−142,920,000
Committee recommendation	−94,400,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−2,400,000
House allowance	+48,520,000

The appropriation recommended for uranium supply and enrichment activities provides for uranium enrichment production, atomic vapor laser isotope separation [AVLIS] research and development, and related support activities. In this account, revenues received through the sale of enrichment services are used to offset costs incurred by the Department in providing these services. The total budget request for fiscal year 1989 is $1,184,000,000. Revenues are estimated in the budget request of $1,276,000,000 which the Department proposes to be deposited directly in the Treasury, and not be used to offset the requested fiscal year 1989 appropriation.

Gaseous diffusion operations and support.—The budget request for this activity is $1,088,900,000 of which $1,014,000,000 is for operating expenses and $74,900,000 is for construction activities. The budget proposes the production of approximately 6.8 million separative work units [SWU] in fiscal year 1989. In order to meet projected 1989 sales levels, the Department will drawdown its remaining enriched uranium inventory to the minimum level.

The Committee recommendation restores $36,520,000 of the $61,520,000 reduction made by the House in diffusion operating expenses in order to avoid unacceptable impacts on the uranium enrichment operations to meet production requirements and to comply with environmental, safety, and health and security and remedial action requirements. Remaining requirements should be met by a reprogramming request or from within available funds or from funds in excess of identified needs,

subject to approval by the Senate and House Committees on Appropriations. The Committee allowance also restores $5,000,000 to project 88–N–502 process inventory control system at the Paducah diffusion plant.

Atomic vapor laser isotope separation.—The budget request for this activity is $90,000,000, of which $84,200,000 is for operating expenses and $5,800,000 is for capital equipment and construction. The Committee believes that the proposed program will not lead to AVLIS deployment in time to respond to competitive market pressures, thus dissipating the U.S. lead and investment in AVLIS. The Committee, therefore, provides $127,000,000 and directs the Department to expedite the completion of the demonstration and to initiate preliminary engineering and related studies for a small early AVLIS plant designed for introduction into the market in the 1996–97 timeframe.

Privatization.—The Committee reiterates its position that any proposal on the part of the Department to transfer any part or all of the enrichment enterprise to the private sector for the purpose of providing enrichment services requires the prior enactment of enabling legislation.

Revenues.—In the Fiscal Year 1987 Energy and Water Development Appropriation Act, Congress reserved to itself the authority to determine the level of any unrecouped costs that must be returned to the Treasury in future legislation. While the Senate has passed legislation on this matter, it is uncertain if final congressional action will occur in this session. Accordingly, the recommended appropriation does not approve the proposed repayment and employs appropriation language which applies estimated fiscal year 1989 revenues to offset the recommended appropriations. Any revenues collected in fiscal year 1989 in excess of the amount needed to fully offset appropriations shall remain in the "Uranium enrichment" account until transferred or otherwise redirected in legislation. The Department is not to take any action to reduce expenditures associated with this appropriation in an effort to maximize or increase the amount of excess fiscal year 1989 revenues.

The following table shows the Committee's recommendation by program.

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
ENERGY APPLICATIONS				
I. Technical Information & Management Program				
Operating expenses	13,100	13,100	13,100	13,100
Capital equipment	900	900	900	900
Construction	---	2,500	2,500	2,500
Support from other programs	---	---	---	---
Subtotal, Technical Information & Mgmt Program	14,000	16,500	16,500	16,500
II. In-house energy management				
Operating expenses	1,900	2,000	2,000	2,000
Construction:				
89-A-601 Modification for energy mgmt	13,046	17,520	17,520	17,520
86-A-602 Solid waste fired boiler (LANCL)	---	---	---	---

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
86-A-604 Waste heat recovery (INL).....	3,934	---	---	---
85-A-602 Fuel storage facility, BNL.....	---	---	---	---
85-A-604 Combustion air preheaters, energy te	---	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction.....	16,980	17,520	17,520	17,520
Total, In-house energy management.....	18,880	19,520	19,520	19,520
III. Strategic facilities utilization program				
Operating expenses.....	1,775	1,977	1,977	1,977
General plant projects.....	400	198	198	198
Subtotal, Strategic facilities utilization prog..	2,175	2,175	2,175	2,175
SUBTOTAL, ENERGY APPLICATIONS.....	35,055	38,195	38,195	38,195

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
(Operating expenses).....	(16,775)	(17,077)	(17,077)	(17,077)
(Capital equipment).....	(900)	(900)	(900)	(900)
(Construction).....	(17,380)	(20,218)	(20,218)	(20,218)
SUBTOTAL, ENERGY SUPPLY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.....	2,108,357	2,112,128	2,072,622	2,208,426
Adjustments:				
Use of prior year balances - (NE) ESRD.....	-16,000	---	---	---
Use of PY balances (from UE).....	-104,000	---	---	---
SBIR from unobligated- (Clean Coal Tech.)ESRD.....	---	---	---	---
TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPLY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.....	1,988,357	2,112,128	2,072,622	2,208,426
(Operating expenses).....	(1,646,724)	(1,820,296)	(1,811,190)	(1,895,594)
(Capital equipment).....	(77,061)	(94,604)	(89,604)	(89,604)
(Construction).....	(264,572)	(197,228)	(171,828)	(223,2..

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
URANIUM ENRICHMENT				
I. Uranium enrichment activities				
A. Gaseous diffusion and operations support				
Operating expenses	847,000	1,014,000	952,480	984,000
Capital equipment	---	12,800	12,800	12,800
Construction:				
89-N-501 UF6 cylinders	---	5,800	5,800	5,800
88-N-501 345/161 KV substation, Paducah, KY,	18,000	---	---	---
89-N-502 General plant projects	---	15,000	15,000	15,000
88-N-502 Process inventory control system, Pa	---	41,300	28,000	33,000
87-N-502 Cooling tower upgrading Paducah, KY.	---	---	---	---

General Science and Research Activities

OPERATING EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1988	$635,423,000
Budget estimate, 1989	[1] 706,916,000
House allowance	[1] 737,916,000
Committee recommendation	[1] 716,916,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+10,000,000
House allowance	−21,000,000

[1] Includes funds requested under a separate basic research user facilities appropriation account.

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

Appropriations, 1988	$174,975,000
Budget estimate, 1989	[1] 490,200,000
House allowance	[1] 191,200,000
Committee recommendation	[1] 217,700,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−272,500,000
House allowance	+26,500,000

[1] Includes funds requested under a separate basic research user facilities appropriation account.

The general science programs are concerned with basic research to discover and understand the fundamental constituents of matter and energy and the basic forces in nature. Understanding of the laws of nature and the basic components from which matter and energy, in all their varied forms are composed, forms the foundation upon which all of modern science and technology rests. Deeper understanding correspondingly contributes, sometimes in spectacular ways, to all of the scientific disciplines and to our Nation's technological base.

The general science program is organized into interrelated scientific programs, high energy physics and nuclear physics. While these programs are not directly associated with energy technology in the near-term or mid-term, they support basic research whose aim is to provide new knowledge which is expected to have long-term scientific and technological impacts on energy development and utilization and on other aspects of our society.

The Committee recommends $934,616,000 for general science and research activities, which is $5,500,000 more than the House allowance, and $124,218,000 over the current level of funding.

High energy physics.—The Committee recommends $656,806,000 for high energy physics, an increase of $92,208,000 over the budget level for fiscal year 1988 and $10,000,000 less than the House allowance.

The administration's fiscal year 1989 budget proposed $363,000,000 for the Superconducting Super Collider [SSC] of which $283,000,000 is for construction and construction-related activities. The Committee has received an unusually large volume of testimony, views, comments, and opinions both for and against this proposed project.

The Committee is in general agreement with the following comments given by esteemed scientists concerning the fiscal year 1989 high energy physics budget: "* * * What is surely on many people's minds in this

budget year is the Superconducting Super Collider, and the impact that this project will have on the rest of science. The SSC will be a magnificant research tool when completed, and should be supported. But because of its size and its cost it will not be available until 1997 at the earliest. * * * All of the progress in high energy physics for the next decade must then come from non-SSC experiments." The Committee agrees.

The recommended appropriation, therefore, provides the full budget request for the existing laboratories and other facilities to produce the physics results that are the justification for the existence of the two premier accelerator physics facilities in the world—the new machines at Stanford and Fermilab—and for other important facilities and activities.

The proponents of the Superconducting Super Collider believe that it represents an extraordinary opportunity to exercise and maintain U.S. leadership in high energy particle physics. The justification for the SSC is that it would provide new insights into the nature of matter and valuable technological advances in such areas as medical treatment, computers, electronics, and superconductive magnets. The administration has identified the SSC as a national priority in science. The Committee agrees that the SSC is an important project and would like to make an American super collider a reality. However, the Committee simply doesn't know where the money is going to come from to undertake this $5,000,000,000 to $8,000,000,000 project.

In its fiscal year 1989 budget request, the administration seeks to fund the Superconducting Super Collider at a level of $363,000,000. Due to budgetary constraints, however, funding at this level for fiscal year 1989 is just not possible without severe impacts on other activities. Accordingly, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $100,000,000 for fiscal year 1989. This level will fund the administration's research and development request and preliminary engineering and design activities. The recommendation provides $84,000,000 for operating expenses, research and development, and preliminary engineering and design, and $16,000,000, the full budget request for capital equipment funds which is related to the R&D work. This total amount of $100,000,000 is $75,000,000 more than was appropriated last fiscal year for the SSC.

This appropriation recognizes the Committee's inability to fund any construction work or long lead items procurement in fiscal year 1989, while ensuring that critical path research developmental activity on the SSC, especially magnet R&D, will proceed in a timely manner.

In light of the budget situation for the forseeable future, the Committee believes that the new administration must either find new sources of revenues to finance new initiatives like the SSC or be more successful than the current administration has been in convincing the Congress to terminate many current ongoing programs to make room for projects and initiatives like the SSC.

Nuclear physics.—The recommendation includes $274,600,000 for nuclear physics activities, an increase of $31,600,000 over the current level.

For the Continuous Electron Beam Accelerator Facility, the Committee recommends an additional $10,500,000 for fiscal year 1989. Continuing to stretch out construction of this project is not in the interest of the taxpayers nor the nuclear physics program.

The Committee does not agree with the House Committee direction to the Department concerning the proposed upgrade of the Bevalac at Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory. The Committee recognizes the important contributions of this machine but believes it is more prudent to defer this matter in light of budget constraints.

The following tabulation shows the Committee recommendation for each program and activity:

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
84-N-405 Utilities upgrading, Phase III.....	---	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction.....	18,000	62,100	48,800	53,800
Subtotal, Gaseous diffusion operations and suppo	865,000	1,088,900	1,014,080	1,050,600
B. Atomic vapor laser isotope separation				
Operating expenses.....	74,000	84,200	104,200	118,600
Capital equipment.....	9,000	4,000	9,000	5,000
Construction:				
89-N-503 General plant projects.....	---	1,800	1,800	3,400
87-N-503 General plant projects, various loca	1,000	---	---	---

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
81-T-502 Demostration facilities.....	6,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction.....	7,000	1,800	1,800	3,400
Subtotal, Atomic vapor laser isotope separation	90,000	90,000	115,000	127,000
C. Gas centrifuge program closeout activities Operating expenses.....	---	---	---	---
D. Program direction - OE.....	5,000	5,100	4,000	4,000
Subtotal, Uranium enrichment activities.....	960,000	1,184,000	1,133,080	1,181,600
Use of Prior Year Balances.....	-10,000	---	---	---
Repayment to Treasury	---	---	---	---
TOTAL URANIUM ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES.....	950,000	1,184,000	1,133,080	1,181,600

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
(Operating expenses).....	(916,000)	(1,103,300)	(1,060,680)	(1,106,600)
(Capital equipment).....	(9,000)	(16,800)	(21,800)	(17,800)
(Construction).....	(25,000)	(63,900)	(50,600)	(57,200)
II. Offsetting revenues.....	(-1,301,000)	(-1,276,000)	(-1,276,000)	(-1,276,000)

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH ACTIVITIES				
I. High energy physics				
A. Physics research				
Operating expenses	116,698	123,806	123,806	123,806
B. Facility operations				
Operating expenses	233,300	256,600	256,600	256,600
Capital equipment	72,800	91,750	75,750	91,750
Construction:				
GP-E-103 General plant projects, various locations	10,700	11,068	11,068	11,068
86-R-104 Ctrl Computing Upgrade (FERMILAB)	11,000	3,632	3,632	3,632
84-ER-133 SLC, SLAC	---	---	---	---

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
81-E-218 TEV I, FNAL	---	---	---	---
86-R-105 AGS Booster	8,300	14,000	14,000	14,000
89-R-101 AIP	11,200	11,700	11,700	11,700
89-R-450 Superconducting Super Collider	---	283,000	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	41,200	323,400	40,400	40,400
Subtotal, Facility operations	347,300	671,750	372,750	388,750
C. High energy technology Operating expenses	96,700	130,200	166,200	150,200
D. Other capital equipment - CE	3,900	4,050	4,050	4,050
General reduction	---	---	---	-10,000
Subtotal, High energy physics	564,598	929,806	666,806	656,806

Basic Research User Facilities

Appropriations, 1988	.....
Budget estimate, 1989	[1] $972,613,000
House allowance	.....
Committee recommendation	.....
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−972,613,000
House allowance	.....

OPERATING EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1988	.....
Budget estimate, 1989	[1] $526,955,000
House allowance	.....
Committee recommendation	.....
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−526,955,000
House allowance	.....

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

Appropriations, 1988	.....
Budget estimate, 1989	[1] $445,658,000
House allowance	.....
Committee recommendation	.....
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−445,658,000
House allowance	.....

[1] Included in "General science and research activities" and "Energy supply, research and development" accounts.

This is a new account proposed by the administration this year for activities historically funded in the "General science and research activities" account and in the "Energy supply, research and development" account. The Committee chose to continue to use the same structure as in fiscal year 1988. Accordingly, the Committee's recommendations for activities proposed in Basic Research User Facilities are included in the "General science and research activities" and "Energy supply, research and development" accounts.

Following is a detailed table of the budget request for the Basic Research User Facilities:

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
(Operating expenses)	(446,698)	(510,606)	(546,606)	(520,606)
(Capital equipment)	(76,700)	(95,800)	(79,800)	(95,800)
(Construction)	(41,200)	(323,400)	(40,400)	(40,400)
II. Nuclear physics				
A. Medium energy physics				
Operating expenses	83,950	87,150	87,150	87,150
B. Heavy ion physics				
Operating expenses	65,280	68,650	68,650	68,650
C. Low energy physics				
Operating expenses	26,195	26,300	26,300	26,300
D. Nuclear theory				
Operating expenses	10,500	11,000	11,000	11,000

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
E. Capital equipment	16,375	17,100	17,100	17,100
F. Construction:				
89-R-201 AIP	---	4,300	4,300	4,300
88-R-201 AIP, various locations	2,300	---	---	---
GP-E-300 General plant projects, various locations	3,600	3,700	3,700	3,700
87-R-203 CEBAF	33,500	44,500	44,500	55,000
Subtotal Construction	39,400	52,500	52,500	63,000
G. Other capital equipment - CE	1,300	1,400	1,400	1,400
Subtotal, Nuclear physics	243,000	264,100	264,100	274,600

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
(Operating expenses).....	(185,925)	(193,100)	(193,100)	(193,100)
(Capital equipment).....	(17,675)	(18,500)	(18,500)	(18,500)
(Construction).....	(39,400)	(52,500)	(52,500)	(63,000)
III. General Science program direction - OE.....	2,800	3,210	3,210	3,210
General reduction.....	---	---	-5,000	---
SUBTOTAL, GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH ACTIVITIES.....	810,398	1,197,116	929,116	934,616
(Operating expenses).....	(635,423)	(706,916)	(737,916)	(716,916)
(Capital equipment).....	(94,375)	(114,300)	(98,300)	(114,300)
(Construction).....	(80,600)	(375,900)	(92,900)	(103,400)

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
BASIC RESEARCH USER FACILITIES (BRUF)				
I. Basic Energy Sciences				
Operating expenses	---	86,293	---	---
Capital equipment	---	6,110	---	---
Construction:				
89-R-600 AIP	---	1,580	---	---
89-R-601 6-7 GeV	---	6,000	---	---
88-R-403 3 GeV spear injector, SSRL	---	6,500	---	---
87-R-403 Neutron Scattering Hall	---	4,000	---	---
87-R-406 1-2 GEV, LBL	---	30,000	---	---
84-ER-111 NSLS, BNL	---	---	---	---

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
84-ER-113 SSRL	---	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	---	48,080	---	---
Subtotal, Basic Energy Sciences (BRUF)	---	140,483	---	---
(Operating expenses)	---	(86,293)	---	---
(Capital equipment)	---	(6,110)	---	---
(Construction)	---	(48,080)	---	---
II. High energy physics				
A. Facility operations				
Operating expenses	---	256,600	---	---
Capital equipment	---	13,700	---	---
Construction:				
84-ER-133 SLC, SLAC	---	---	---	---

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
81-E-218 TEV I, FNAL	---	---	---	---
86-R-105 AGS Booster	---	14,000	---	---
89-R-301 AIP	---	11,700	---	---
GP-E-302 GPP	---	5,318	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	---	31,018	---	---
Subtotal, Facility Operations	---	301,318	---	---
B. High energy technology Operating expenses	---	45,100	---	---
Total, High Energy Physics (BRUF)	---	346,418	---	---
(Operating expenses)	---	(301,700)	---	---
(Capital equipment)	---	(13,700)	---	---
(Construction)	---	(31,018)	---	---

NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL FUND

Appropriations, 1988	$360,000,000
Budget estimate, 1989	448,832,000
House allowance	369,832,000
Committee recommendation	369,832,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−79,000,000
House allowance	

The Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 and the Nuclear Waste Policy Act Amendments of 1987 provide for the development, construction, and operation of a repository for the disposal of high-level nuclear waste and spent fuel. Funds for these activities are provided from the nuclear waste fund, which receives payments from electric utilities of 1 mil per kilowatt hour for electricity produced in nuclear powerplants. Expenditures from the fund may be made only to the extent approved in advance in appropriations acts. In fiscal year 1989, the funds will generate revenues of $713,600,000 derived from fees and interest income.

The goal of the nuclear waste disposal fund program is to obtain licenses for, construct, and operate a waste management system for the disposal of spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste from commercial and atomic energy defense activities in a manner that is safe and environmentally acceptable and in conformance with the Nuclear Waste Policy Act [NWPA] of 1982 and NWPA Amendments of 1987. Yucca Mountain, NV, has been designated as the site for detailed site characterization activities and in accordance with the amended legislation, all work on the second repository has been terminated. The amended legislation also authorizes a monitored retrievable storage [MRS] facility as an integral part of the overall waste management system and places certain conditions on its siting, construction, and operation.

The overall budget request for this activity is $448,832,000 including $15,000,000 for analysis of a monitored retrievable storage site. The allowance provides $369,832,000, reflecting a reduction of $79,000,000 from the budget request.

An amount not to exceed $11,000,000, at an annualized rate, may be provided to the State of Nevada for the period July 1, 1988 through June 30, 1989, for the conduct of its oversight responsibilities pursuant to the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, Public Law 97–425, as amended. Further, an amount not to exceed $5,000,000, at an annualized rate, may be provided to affected local governments, as defined in the act, to conduct appropriate activities pursuant to the act.

Of this amount, $1,000,000 is for studies and assessment of transportation needs and requirements in connection with the movement of nuclear waste within the State of Nevada at the University of Nevada-Reno or other appropriate place as determined by the State.

It was never the intent of Congress that the State of Nevada, or any volunteer State or Indian tribe, conduct its own site characterization program. Grant funding provided pursuant to the act is to be used

solely for the purpose of oversight of the Department of Energy's program. Such oversight is not intended to duplicate data collection done by the Department of Energy. It is further the intent of Congress that grant funds are to be spent to the maximum extent practicable within the State of Nevada. The Committee does not intend that grant funds be used to support multistate efforts or for coalition building with respect to the transportation of nuclear waste to a repository in Nevada. Further, such grant funds shall not be used to support, directly or indirectly, lobbying activities, subject to the same prohibitions of 18 U.S.C. 1913.

An Advisory Committee on High Level Waste Licensing Support System has been meeting since September 1987 on a negotiated rulemaking by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. The intent of this rulemaking is to provide the procedure for applications for a license to receive and process high-level radioactive waste and spent nuclear fuel at a geologic repository that will be based on an electronic information management system called the licensing support system [LSS] that will contain material from the license applicant—the Department of Energy—its contractors, and all other potential participants in the high-level radioactive waste licensing proceeding. It is presently intended that the LSS will not be part of any computer system that is controlled by any potential participant to the high-level waste proceeding including DOE and its contractors, nor should the LSS be physically located on the premises of any of the potential participants. Nevertheless, DOE or other potential participants would not be precluded from using the LSS computer facility for a records management system independent of the LSS. The Committee agrees that funds provided in the fiscal year 1989 appropriation are to be used to initiate this work in this fiscal year and that the University of Nevada/Las Vegas be designated as the site of the computer facility that would incorporate both the LSS and independent records management system of other potential participants including the Department and the NRC. An amount of $6,000,000 is made available for this purpose and to work out a cooperative arrangement with the university.

The Committee is concerned with the limited effort by DOE in response to the directive of Congress in the Fiscal Year 1987 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act to evaluate the use of lead in high-level nuclear waste disposal canisters. The Brookhaven National Laboratory [BNL] study undertaken as a result of this directive did not consider current technologies such as those being developed in Canada, Sweden, Belgium, and Argentina, as well as the United States, to determine whether or not this would be a viable technology in the United States permanent waste repository project.

Therefore, the Committee directs that from within this nuclear waste disposal fund appropriation, $500,000 be for planning and assessment activities to review the BNL studies in regard to recent international work in this subject; identify additional information required; establish a peer review panel to review and recommend appropriate research

tasks that must be taken to complete the evaluation directed in the Fiscal Year 1987 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act. The panel should include appropriate scientific and technical persons from DOE and associated laboratories, BNL and INEL, the Bureau of Mines, and individuals having relevant expertise, for example, International Lead Zinc Research Organization.

Atomic Energy Defense Activities

OPERATING EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1988	$6,253,465,000
Budget estimate, 1989	6,632,025,000
House allowance	6,627,025,000
Committee recommendation	6,657,025,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+25,000,000
House allowance	+30,000,000

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

Appropriations, 1988	$1,495,899,000
Budget estimate, 1989	1,467,975,000
House allowance	1,472,975,000
Committee recommendation	1,435,075,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−32,900,000
House allowance	−37,900,000

The Committee recommends a total appropriation of $8,092,100,000 for atomic energy defense activities.

The appropriation recommended for atomic energy defense activities supports inertial confinement fusion, naval reactors development, the research, development, testing, production and stockpile maintenance for nuclear weapons, verification and control technology, special materials production, defense waste management, and nuclear materials security and safeguards.

WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

This program provides for the research, development, engineering, testing, and production of all U.S. nuclear weapons; maintenance of reliable weapons for their stockpile life; and retirement and disposal of nuclear weapons from the stockpile. The fiscal year 1989 recommendation will continue efforts to provide new technology to maintain a modern nuclear force, along with the design and development of new weapons systems in response to defense requirements.

The Committee recommendation for weapons activities totals $3,811,671,000 of which $3,181,345,000 is the operating expenses and $630,326,000 is for plant and capital equipment. This is $3,500,000 more than the budget request and reflects an increase of $42,276,000 compared to fiscal year 1988 appropriations.

Weapons activities are comprised of the following subcategories: research and development, testing activities, production and surveillance, and program direction.

Research and development.—The Committee recommends $1,019,682,000 for research and development activities, an increase of $26,281,000 over the 1988 level and $14,500,000 above the budget request.

Testing.—The Committee recommendation for testing activities totals $467,361,000 which reflects an increase of $7,000,000 over the budget request, reflecting an increase in operating expenses.

The Committee recommendation includes $4,850,000 for the Marshall Islands radiological activities including: $1,100,000 for logistical support; $1,150,000 for the medical program and referrals; $1,300,000 for the environmental studies of the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, including Rongelap; and $1,300,000 for whole-body counting and estimating plutonium levels in the people of Rongelap. The Department is directed to prepare a report on a coordinated plan for continuation of these efforts in future years, including estimated costs and sources of funding. Congress has recognized our moral obligation to continue radiological monitoring and health care for those Marshallese affected by the nuclear testing program; and the Committee recognizes the concern of the affected peoples regarding these activities and expects that the Department will cooperate with them in providing for external review of the Department's activities.

Production and surveillance.—The Committee recommendation for production and surveillance totals $2,243,228,000, a reduction of $18,000,000 below the budget request and House allowance. The reduction reflects the deletion of funds for the modification to Building 371 at Rocky Flats which was not authorized.

Nuclear directed energy weapons.—The Committee recommendation for nuclear directed energy weapons is $255,000,000, an increase of $10,000,000 above the House allowance.

Inertial confinement fusion.—The Committee recommendation for inertial confinement fusion [ICF] is $163,770,000 which includes a recommendation of $155,530,000 for operating expenses and $8,240,000 for capital equipment.

The Committee is also aware of the significant progress being made in inertial confinement fusion research. Given these recent encouraging developments in the ICF program, the Committee directs DOE to request a National Academy of Sciences review of the status of the program and whether the recommendations previously made are still appropriate to advance the technology. As a part of the review, an assessment of the civilian energy potential of inertial confinement fusion is to be included and reported to the appropriate committees of the Congress.

The recommended appropriation provides $16,800,000 in operating expenses for research program activities at KMSF and $700,000 for capital equipment at KMSF as proposed in the Senate-passed authorization measure.

MATERIALS PRODUCTION

The Materials Production Program provides nuclear materials to meet near-term national defense and nondefense requirements. In addition, materials production sustains a base production program capable of meeting long-term nuclear materials production requirements consistent with the annual Presidential nuclear weapons stockpile memorandum and the annual Department of Energy materials management plan.

The Materials Production Program operates a reactor feed material production complex, production reactors at Savannah River, spent fuel chemical processing plants at Savannah River, Richland, and Idaho, and support facilities. These facilities are unique to the production of nuclear materials for defense purposes.

The Committee recommendation for materials production totals $1,980,359,000 which is $36,400,000 below the budget request and House allowance.

The Materials Production Program is organized into the following subcategories: Reactor operations, processing of nuclear materials, supporting services, enriched material, capital equipment, and program direction.

The Committee recommendation is the same as the budget request in all subcategories except for reactor operations, where a reduction of $21,500,000 has been made due to the action taken in the Senate-passed authorization bill which reduced funds for this activity. Also, a reduction of $14,900,000 has been approved for project 85–D–139, fuel processing restoration, Idaho Fuels processing facility, due to schedule delays. The GAO recently advised the Committee of these delays reducing the funds needed in fiscal year 1989 as a result of continuing GAO examinations of DOE projects since the formulation of the budget requests.

The full amount requested, $60,000,000 for the new production capacity is included in the recommendation. The Committee feels it is essential that the Department address the serious national security implication of siting all production capacity in one location. Accordingly, the Committee directs the Department to consider in its siting and technology decisions the advantages of dual siting from a national security perspective. The Committee believes that the minimal additional costs anticipated for construction at two sites are far outweighed by the security gained by such an approach. The Committee wishes to clarify that the dual siting approach does not in any way mean duplicating a full-scale plant at a second site. Rather, it assumes that the aggregate capacity requirements be split between the two sites via the construction of smaller units, including modular construction.

The Committee has also approved the full amount of $101,400,000 requested for the SIS. The SIS, when completed at the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory in 1995, will provide the Nation's nuclear materials production complex with greatly needed flexibility, technological diversity and contingency in the production of nuclear materials for defense applications.

DEFENSE WASTE AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION

The Defense Waste and Environmental Restoration Program includes near-term and longer term activities to assure that existing and future nuclear waste from Federal Government program activities can be isolated from the biosphere and pose no significant threat to public health and safety. For the near term, the wastes are managed through interim storage facilities. Simultaneous efforts are proceeding on development of technology and processes for long-term disposal.

The Committee recommendation provides a total of $976,500,000 for defense nuclear waste and environmental restoration activities, $40,000,000 above the budget request and $5,000,000 above the House allowance. No specific allocation, ceilings, or floors are recommended by the Committee at this time. The proposed authorization does not include any such allocation and the Committee believes that to do so now only serves to penalize other waste sites and activities if provided without added funding.

The recommendations provide for the same amount of the budget request or as provided for in the Senate-passed authorization bill.

Within the amount provided for waste operations and projects, the Committee approves an allocation of $3,000,000, the same as the House bill, for development of alternative and innovative technologies for cleaning up hazardous waste sites at the Pacific Northwest Hazardous Substance Research, Development, and Demonstration Center. The Committee's recommendation also includes $43,000,000 for road improvements associated with construction of the waste isolation pilot plant.

NAVAL REACTORS DEVELOPMENT

The Naval Reactors Development Program provides for the design, development, testing, and evaluation of improved naval nuclear propulsion plants and reactor cores. The nuclear propulsion plants and cores cover a wide range of configurations and power ratings suitable for installation in naval combatants varying in size from small submarines to large surface ships.

The Committee recommendation includes $630,000,000 for the Naval Reactor Development Program, the same as the budget and House bill.

VERIFICATION AND CONTROL TECHNOLOGY

This program provides for the research, development, testing, and support activities related to the detection of nuclear test activities in response to treaty verification and national security requirements; analysis and support for nuclear intelligence, export control and arms control issues; and the review of export licenses applications as required by the Atomic Energy Act as amended, the Nuclear Nonproliferation Act of 1978, and the Export Administration Act of 1979.

The Committee recommendation for verification and control technology provides $154,600,000, which is $15,000,000 more than the budget

request and the House allowance. This is also the same as the Senate authorization.

NUCLEAR SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY

The Committee recommends $80,200,000 for nuclear materials security and safeguards development within this program, the same as the budget request and the House allowance.

SECURITY INVESTIGATIONS

The recommendation includes $40,000,000 for security investigations, the same as the budget request and the House allowance.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Details of the Committee's recommendation, current year estimates, the budget request, and House allowance are shown in the following table:

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
III. Nuclear Physics				
A. Medium energy physics				
Operating expenses	---	49,600	---	---
B. Heavy ion physics				
Operating expenses	---	25,362	---	---
Capital equipment	---	1,050	---	---
Construction:				
89-R-501 AIP	---	1,700	---	---
GP-E-500 GPP (LANL)	---	500	---	---
87-R-203 CEBAF	---	44,500	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	---	46,700	---	---
Total, Nuclear Physics (BRUF)	---	122,712	---	---

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
(Operating expenses)	---	(74,962)	---	---
(Capital equipment)	---	(1,050)	---	---
(Construction)	---	(46,700)	---	---
IV. Superconducting Super Collider				
Operating expenses	---	64,000	---	---
Capital equipment	---	16,000	---	---
Construction:				
89-R-450 Superconducting Super Collider	---	283,000	---	---
Subtotal, Superconducting Super Collider	---	363,000	---	---
Total, Basic Research User Facilities	---	972,613	---	---
(Operating expenses)	---	(526,955)	---	---
(Capital Equipment)	---	(36,860)	---	---
(Construction)	---	(408,798)	---	---

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES				
I. WEAPONS ACTIVITIES				
A. Research and development				
1. Research and development - Core				
a. Operating expenses.....	769,019	766,000	771,000	780,500
b. Capital equipment.....	87,020	89,730	89,730	89,730
c. Construction:				
89-D-101 General plant projects, various locations (portion in Testing)	---	19,500	19,500	19,500
88-D-101 General plant projects, various locations.....	17,800	---	---	---
88-D-105 Special nuclear materials R&D laboratory replacement, LANL	10,000	22,000	22,000	22,000

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
88-D-106 Nuclear weapons research, development, & testing facilities revitalization, Phase II, various locations	21,962	60,352	60,352	60,352
locations	---	---	---	---
86-D-105 Instrumentation systems laboratory, SNL	8,000	---	---	---
86-D-106 Lab data communication center, LANL	12,200	---	---	---
85-D-102 Nuclear weapons research, development, and testing facilities revitalization, Phase I, various locations	33,500	6,800	6,800	6,800
circuit lab, SNLA	---	---	---	---
SNLA	---	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	103,462	108,652	108,652	108,652
Subtotal, Research and development - Weapons	959,501	964,382	969,382	978,882

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
2. Environment, safety & health - construction				
88-D-102 Sanitary wastewater systems consolidation, LANL	1,000	7,600	7,600	7,600
88-D-103 Seismic upgrade-Bldg 111, LLNL	1,100	5,400	5,400	5,400
86-D-103 Decontamination and waste treatment facility, LLNL	12,000	12,000	12,000	12,000
Subtotal, ES&H construction	14,100	25,000	25,000	25,000
3. Safeguards & security - construction				
88-D-104 Safeguards and security upgrade, Phase II, LANL	3,500	7,300	7,300	7,300
87-D-104 Safeguards and security enhancement, phase II, LLNL	7,000	8,500	8,500	8,500

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
85-D-103 Safeguards and security enhancements, LLNL and SNLL	9,200	---	---	---
85-D-106 Hardened engineering test blds, LLNL	100	---	---	---
Subtotal, Safeguards & security - construction	19,800	15,800	15,800	15,800
Subtotal, Research and development	993,401	1,005,182	1,010,182	1,019,682
B. Testing				
1. Testing - Core				
a. Operating expenses	396,550	403,000	403,000	410,000
b. Capital equipment	37,050	38,161	38,161	38,161
c. Construction:				
85-D-101 General plant projects, various locations	---	7,000	7,000	7,000

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
88-D-101 General plant projects, various locations	6,400	---	---	---
87-D-101 General plant projects, NTS	---	---	---	---
84-D-107 Nuclear testing facilities revitalization, various locations	5,458	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	11,858	7,000	7,000	7,000
Subtotal, weapons program	445,458	448,161	448,161	455,161
2. Safeguards & security - construction				
85-D-105 Combined device assembly facility, Nevada Test Site, NV	28,000	12,200	12,200	12,200
Subtotal, Testing	473,458	460,361	460,361	467,361

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Subtotal, Research, development and testing.....	1,466,859	1,465,543	1,470,543	1,487,043
(Operating expenses).....	(1,165,569)	(1,169,000)	(1,174,000)	(1,190,500)
(Capital equipment).....	(124,070)	(127,891)	(127,891)	(127,891)
(Construction).....	(177,220)	(168,652)	(168,652)	(168,652)
C. Production and surveillance				
Operating expenses.....	1,853,690	1,909,445	1,909,445	1,909,445
Capital equipment.....	115,160	118,614	118,614	118,614
Construction:				
Decision costs - construction:				
88-D-129 Small intercontinental ballistic missile (SICBM) warhead production facs, various locations.....	29,400	---	---	---

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
87-D-122 Short-range attack missile II (SRAM II) warhead production facilities, various locations	---	26,000	26,000	26,000
various locations	---	---	---	---
84-D-112 TRIDENT II warhead production facilities, various locations	1,864	---	---	---
projectile (AFAP) prod facs, var locations	---	---	---	---
Subtotal, Decision costs - construction	31,264	26,000	26,000	26,000
Production base - construction:				
Restoration:				
82-D-107 Utilities & equip restoration, replace & upgrade, Phase III, var locations	76,929	---	---	---

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Facilities capability program:				
88-D-122 Facilities capability assurance program, various locations.....	15,400	79,341	79,341	79,341
Production support facilities:				
89-D-121 General plant projects, various locations	---	29,194	29,194	29,194
89-D-122 Production waste storage facilities, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN	---	2,000	2,000	2,000
89-D-125 Plutonium recovery modification project (Bldg. 371), Rocky Flats Plant, Golden, CO	---	18,000	18,000	---
88-D-121 General plant projects, various locations.....	26,500	---	---	---

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
88-D-125 High explosive machining facility, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX.....	2,700	13,000	13,000	13,000
locations.....	---	---	---	---
87-D-123 Protective clothing decon facility, Rocky Flats, Golden, CO.....	4,608	---	---	---
86-D-130 Tritium loading facility replacement, Savannah River, Aiken, SC	43,948	31,800	31,800	31,800
85-D-112 Enriched uranium recovery improvements, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN	11,263	1,281	1,281	1,281
Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	---	---	---	---
85-D-115 Renovate plutonium building utility systems, Rocky Flats, CO	1,060	---	---	---
Subtotal, Production support facilities	90,079	95,275	95,275	77,275
Subtotal, Production base - construction	182,408	174,616	174,616	156,616

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Environmental, safety & health - construction:				
89-D-126 Environmental, safety, & health upgrade, Phase II, Mound Plant, Miamisburg, OH	---	800	800	800
88-D-124 Fire protection upgrade, various locations	1,700	6,500	6,500	6,500
88-D-126 Personnel radiological monitoring laboratories, various locations	1,000	5,000	5,000	5,000
87-D-127 ES&H Upgrade, Mound Facility, Miamisburg, OH	1,737	---	---	---
86-D-122 Structural upgrade of existing plutonium facilities, Rocky Flats Plant, Golden, CO	221	---	---	---

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
86-D-123 Environmental hazards elimination, various locations	8,086	5,203	5,203	5,203
85-D-121 Air and water pollution control facs, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN	998	---	---	---
84-D-124 Environmental improvements, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN	5,878	4,775	4,775	4,775
Subtotal, Environ., safety & health - constr.	19,620	22,278	22,278	22,278
Safeguards & security:				
88-D-123 Security enhancements, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	5,700	7,500	7,500	7,500
87-D-130 Receiving and shipping facility, Pinellas Plant, St. Petersburg, FL	2,400	---	---	---
Miamisburg, OH	---	---	---	---

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
86-D-125 Safeguards and site security upgrading, Ph. II, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	2,000	---	---	---
upgrade, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	---	---	---	---
84-D-211 Safeguards and site security upgrading, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN	15,478	2,775	2,775	2,775
upgrade, Pinellas Plant, FL	---	---	---	---
Subtotal, Safeguards & security	25,578	10,275	10,275	10,275
Subtotal, Construction	258,870	233,169	233,169	215,169
Subtotal, Production and surveillance	2,227,720	2,261,228	2,261,228	2,243,228
(Operating expenses)	(1,853,690)	(1,909,445)	(1,909,445)	(1,909,445)
(Capital Equipment)	(115,160)	(118,614)	(118,614)	(118,614)
(Construction)	(258,870)	(233,169)	(233,169)	(215,169)

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
D. Program direction				
Operating expenses				
1. Weapons program	66,848	72,166	72,166	72,166
2. Community assistance	7,978	9,234	9,234	9,234
Subtotal, Program direction	74,826	81,400	81,400	81,400
Subtotal, Weapons activities	3,769,405	3,808,171	3,813,171	3,811,671
(Operating expenses)	(3,094,085)	(3,159,845)	(3,164,845)	(3,181,345)
(Capital equipment)	(239,230)	(246,505)	(246,505)	(246,505)
(Construction)	(436,090)	(401,821)	(401,821)	(383,821)
II. NUCLEAR DIRECTED ENERGY WEAPONS				
a. Operating expenses	240,000	252,254	212,254	222,254
b. Capital equipment	17,000	17,509	17,509	17,509
c. Construction:				

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
88-D-106 Nuclear weapons research, development and testing facilities revitalization, Phase II, (NDER facility at LLNL).....	7,000	12,000	12,000	12,000
86-D-104 Strategic defenses facility, SNLA	15,000	3,237	3,237	3,237
Subtotal, Construction.....	22,000	15,237	15,237	15,237
Subtotal, Nuclear directed energy weapons.....	279,000	285,000	245,000	255,000
III. INERTIAL FUSION				
a. Operating expenses.....	151,000	155,530	155,530	155,530
b. Capital equipment.....	8,000	8,240	8,240	8,240
Subtotal, Inertial fusion	159,000	163,770	163,770	163,770

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
IV. MATERIALS PRODUCTION				
A. Reactor operations				
Operating expenses	550,035	603,976	603,976	582,476
Construction				
Programmatic projects:				
88-D-154 New production reactor, design only, site to be determined	10,000	35,000	35,000	35,000
N-Reactor, Richland, WA	---	---	---	---
86-D-152 Reactor electrical distribution system, Savannah River, SC	4,500	6,000	6,000	6,000

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
85-D-145 Fuel production facility, Savannah River, SC	21,100	---	---	---
modifications, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN	---	---	---	---
Subtotal, programmatic projects	35,600	41,000	41,000	41,000
Environment, safety & health projects:				
89-D-141 M-Area waste disposal, Savannah River, SC	---	3,600	3,600	3,600
89-D-142 Reactor effluent cooling water thermal mitigation, Savannah River, SC	---	1,000	1,000	1,000
89-D-148 Improved reactor confinement system, design only, Savannah River, SC	---	2,000	2,000	2,000
Subtotal, ES&H projects	---	6,600	6,600	6,600

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Subtotal, Construction	35,600	47,600	47,600	47,600
Subtotal, Reactor operations	585,635	651,576	651,576	630,076
B. Processing of nuclear materials				
Operating expenses	475,700	511,717	511,717	511,717
Construction				
Programmatic projects:				
86-D-148 Special isotope separation project, Idaho Falls, ID	25,000	28,000	28,000	28,000
86-D-151 PUREX electrical system upgrade, Richland, WA	1,900	---	---	---
Savannah River, SC	---	---	---	---

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
84-D-135 Process facility modifications, Richland, WA	10,000	---	---	---
Prior year projects	---	---	---	---
Subtotal, programmatic projects	36,900	28,000	28,000	28,000
Environment, safety & health projects:				
86-D-154 Effluent treatment facility, Savannah River, SC	19,175	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	56,075	28,000	28,000	28,000
Subtotal, Processing of nuclear materials	531,775	539,717	539,717	539,717

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
C. Supporting services				
Operating expenses	221,747	259,679	259,679	259,679
Construction projects				
Programmatic projects:				
89-D-146 General plant projects, various locations	---	35,260	35,260	35,260
88-D-146 General plant projects, various locations	31,230	---	---	---
locations	---	---	---	---
86-D-149 Productivity retention program, Phase I & II & III & IV, various locations	55,160	72,140	72,140	72,140
85-D-139 Fuel processing restoration, Idaho Fuels Processing Facility, INEL, ID	28,000	65,000	65,000	50,100

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
85-D-140 Productivity and radiological improvements, FMPC, Fernald, OH	7,831	---	---	---
82-D-124 Restoration of production capabilities, Phases II, III, IV, & V, various locations	10,600	5,879	5,879	5,879
Subtotal, programmatic projects.....	132,821	178,279	178,279	163,379
Environment, safety & health projects: process sewers, Richland, WA.....	---	---	---	---
87-D-150 Radioactive liquid effluent treatment facility, module 1, Richland, WA	5,000	---	---	---
87-D-152 Environmental protection plantwide, Savannah River, SC.....	2,800	2,224	2,224	2,224

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
87-D-159 Environmental, health, and safety improvements, Phases I, II, & III, Feed Materials Production Center, Fernald, OH	35,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Subtotal, ES&H projects.....	42,800	52,224	52,224	52,224
Safeguards & security projects:				
89-D-140 Additional separations safeguards, Savannah River, SC	---	5,300	5,300	5,300
88-D-153 Additional reactor safeguards, Savannah River, SC.....	2,900	5,700	5,700	5,700
86-D-156 Plantwide safeguards systems, Savannah River, SC	13,000	12,800	12,800	12,800
84-D-134 Safeguards and security improvements, plantwide, Savannah River, SC	9,685	11,584	11,584	11,584
IFPF, INEL, ID	---	---	---	---

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Subtotal, safeguards & security projects.....	25,585	35,384	35,384	35,384
Subtotal, Construction.....	201,206	265,887	265,887	250,987
Subtotal, Supporting services.....	422,953	525,566	525,566	510,666
D. Enriched material	153,000	169,000	169,000	169,000
E. Capital equipment	91,285	102,500	102,500	102,500
F. Program direction.....	24,039	28,400	28,400	28,400
Subtotal, Materials production.....	1,808,687	2,016,759	2,016,759	1,980,359
(Operating expenses).....	(1,424,521)	(1,572,772)	(1,572,772)	(1,551,272)
(Capital equipment).....	(91,285)	(102,500)	(102,500)	(102,500)
(Construction).....	(292,881)	(341,487)	(341,487)	(326,587)

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
V. DEFENSE WASTE AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION				
A. Environmental restoration - operating expenses	97,798	120,925	138,925	160,925
B. Waste operations and projects				
Operating expenses.....	411,597	532,042	544,042	532,042
Construction				
Programmatic projects:				
89-D-170 General plant projects, waste operations and projects, and waste research and development, various locations	---	28,000	28,000	28,000
89-D-171 INEL road renovation, ID	---	4,000	4,000	4,000
89-D-174 Replacement high level waste evaporator, Savannah River, SC	---	3,520	3,520	3,520

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
88-D-171 General plant projects,various locations	20,436	---	---	---
88-D-173 Hanford waste vitrification plant, Richland, WA	7,500	22,500	27,500	22,500
locations	---	---	---	---
87-D-173 242-A Evaporator crystallizer upgrade, Richland, WA	7,200	1,944	1,944	1,944
87-D-174 241-AQ Tank farm, Richland, WA	22,300	---	---	---
87-D-175 Steam system rehab, Ph I, RL	12,600	---	---	---
87-D-180 Burial ground expansion, Savannah River, SC	8,200	2,068	2,068	2,068
87-D-181 Diversion box and pump pit containment buildings, Savannah River, SC	6,800	6,371	6,371	6,371

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
86-D-174 Low-level waste processing and shipping system, FMPC, Fernald, OH	4,628	---	---	---
85-D-157 Seventh calcined solids storage facility, INEL, ID	2,181	---	---	---
85-D-159 New waste transfer facilities				
H-Area, Savannah River, SC	13,682	---	---	---
Richland, WA	---	---	---	---
81-T-105 Defense waste processing facility, Savannah River, SC	120,000	92,462	92,462	92,462
77-13-F Waste isolation pilot plant, Delaware Basin, Southeast, NM	35,901	---	---	---
Prior year projects	---	---	---	---
Subtotal, programmatic projects	261,428	160,865	165,865	160,865

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Environment, safety & health projects:				
89-D-172 Hanford environmental compliance, Richland, WA	---	12,000	12,000	12,000
89-D-173 Tank farm ventilation upgrade, Richland, WA	---	1,800	1,800	1,800
89-D-175 Hazardous waste/mixed waste disposal facility, Savannah River, SC	---	3,500	3,500	3,500
87-D-172 WESF K-3 Filter upgrade, Richland, WA	2,800	---	---	---
87-D-177 Test reactor area liquid radioactive waste cleanup system, Phase III, INEL, ID	3,900	911	911	911
86-D-172 B-Plant F-Filter, Richland, WA	---	---	---	---

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
85-D-158 Central warehouse upgrade, Richland, WA	56	---	---	---
83-D-148 Non-radioactive hazardous waste management, Savannah River, SC	4,200	13,000	13,000	13,000
Subtotal, ES&H projects	10,956	31,211	31,211	31,211
Safeguards & security projects:				
86-D-175 INEL security upgrade, ID	742	2,084	2,084	2,084
upgrade, INEL, ID	---	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	273,126	194,160	199,160	194,160
Subtotal, Waste operations and projects	684,723	726,202	743,202	726,202

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
C. Waste research and development				
Operating expenses	51,082	58,460	58,460	58,460
D. Hazardous waste & compliance technology	7,112	8,377	8,377	8,377
E. Transportation management	8,400	9,720	9,720	9,720
F. Capital equipment	43,687	52,716	52,716	52,716
G. Program direction	2,530	3,100	3,100	3,100
Use of prior year AEDA balances	---	-43,000	-43,000	-43,000
Subtotal, Defense waste & environmental restor.	895,332	936,500	971,500	976,500
(Operating expenses)	(578,519)	(689,624)	(719,624)	(729,624)
(Capital equipment)	(43,687)	(52,716)	(52,716)	(52,716)
(Construction)	(273,126)	(194,160)	(199,160)	(194,160)

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

OPERATING EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1988	$389,536,000
Budget estimate, 1989	394,925,000
House allowance	396,503,000
Committee recommendation	396,503,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+1,578,000
House allowance	

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

Appropriations, 1988	$5,977,000
Budget estimate, 1989	7,162,000
House allowance	7,162,000
Committee recommendation	7,162,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

The Committee recommends a net appropriation of $162,940,000 for departmental administration.

The appropriation recommended for departmental administration supports the Department's general management, administrative, and program support functions not directly associated with program execution. The account provides for: (1) development and analysis of alternative energy policy proposals, legislation, and evaluation of DOE programs; (2) the salaries, travel, and other costs associated with the management and support of DOE; (3) the Institutional Relations Program that provides information services and outreach activities focusing on the industrial, academic, and public communities, evaluation of energy-related inventions and support for energy training and education; (4) the performance of security investigations for persons with access to restricted atomic energy data; (5) development of international energy policy and international cooperation in energy matters; and (6) revenues from the sale of DOE products and services and their related direct costs.

The following tables show the Committee recommendations by program for new (budget) obligational authority in comparison to the current year, the budget estimate, and the House allowance.

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
VI. NAVAL REACTORS DEVELOPMENT				
A. Plant development				
Operating expenses	74,000	83,000	83,000	83,000
B. Reactor development				
Operating expenses	249,700	236,700	236,700	236,700
C. Reactor operation and evaluation				
Operating expenses	208,000	222,700	222,700	222,700
D. Capital equipment	45,000	48,000	48,000	48,000
E. Construction				
89-N-101 General plant projects, various locations	---	7,000	7,000	7,000
89-N-102 Heat transfer test facility, KAPL, Niskayuna, NY	---	2,800	2,800	2,800

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
89-N-103 Advanced test reactor modifications, Test Reactor Area, INEL, ID	---	1,600	1,600	1,600
89-N-104 Power system upgrade, Naval Reactors Facility, ID	---	600	600	600
88-N-101 General plant projects, various locations.....	6,000	---	---	---
88-N-102 Expended core facility receiving station, Naval Reactors Facility, ID.....	2,100	5,900	5,900	5,900
88-N-103 Material handling and storage modifications, KAPL, Niskayuna, NY.....	400	2,700	2,700	2,700
88-N-104 Prototype availability facilities, KAPL, Kesselring Site, West Milton, NY	1,000	6,000	6,000	6,000
locations.....	---	---	---	---

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
87-N-102 Kesselring site facilities upgrade,				
KAPL, West Milton, NY	8,400	---	---	---
Bettis, Pittsburgh, PA	---	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	17,900	26,600	26,600	26,600
F. Program direction	12,400	13,000	13,000	13,000
Subtotal, Naval reactors development	607,000	630,000	630,000	630,000
(Operating expenses)	(544,100)	(555,400)	(555,400)	(555,400)
(Capital equipment)	(45,000)	(48,000)	(48,000)	(48,000)
(Construction)	(17,900)	(26,600)	(26,600)	(26,600)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
VII. OTHER NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS				
A. Verification and control technology				
1. Verification and control technology				
Operating expenses	115,900	131,200	131,200	146,200
Capital equipment	5,100	8,400	8,400	8,400
85-D-171 Space science laboratory, LANL, NM	---	---	---	---
Subtotal, Verification and control technology	121,000	139,600	139,600	154,600
(Operating expenses)	(115,900)	(131,200)	(131,200)	(146,200)
(Capital equipment)	(5,100)	(8,400)	(8,400)	(8,400)

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
B. Nuclear safeguards and security				
1. Nuclear safeguards and security				
Operating expenses	73,340	75,400	75,400	75,400
Capital equipment	4,600	4,800	4,800	4,800
86-D-186 Nuclear safeguards technology lab, LANL, NM	---	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	---	---	---	---
Subtotal Nuclear safeguards and security	77,940	80,200	80,200	80,200
(Operating expenses)	(73,340)	(75,400)	(75,400)	(75,400)
(Capital equipment)	(4,600)	(4,800)	(4,800)	(4,800)
C. Security investigations - OE	32,000	40,000	40,000	40,000
Subtotal, All Other	230,940	259,800	259,800	274,800

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
(Operating expenses)	(221,240)	(246,600)	(246,600)	(261,600)
(Capital equipment)	(9,700)	(13,200)	(13,200)	(13,200)
TOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	7,749,364	8,100,000	8,100,000	8,092,100
(Operating expenses)	(6,253,465)	(6,632,025)	(6,627,025)	(6,657,025)
(Capital equipment)	(453,902)	(488,670)	(488,670)	(488,670)
(Construction)	(1,041,997)	(979,305)	(984,305)	(946,405)

Power Marketing Administrations

Section 302(a) of Public Law 95–91 transferred to the Department of Energy the power marketing functions under section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 and all other functions of the Department of the Interior with respect to the Alaska Power Administration. Bonneville Power Administration, the Southeastern Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration, and the power marketing functions of the Bureau of Reclamation including the transmission and disposition of the Bureau of Reclamation including the transmission and disposition of electric power and energy from Falcon and Amistad Dams, now included in the Western Area Power Administration.

Bonneville Power operations are self-financing under authority of the Federal Columbia River Transmission System Act of 1974. The act authorizes Bonneville Power to use its revenues to finance operating costs, capital construction, and to sell bonds to the Treasury if necessary to finance any remaining capital program requirements. All of the other power marketing administrations are funded annually with appropriations and related receipts are deposited in the Treasury.

The following table summarizes the appropriations recommended for the power marketing administrations.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION				
I. Office of the Secretary - Salaries and expenses..	2,191	2,204	2,204	2,204
II. General management - Personnel Compensation and Benefits.....	161,650	158,533	158,533	158,533
III. General management - other expenses				
A. Travel.....	6,260	5,625	5,625	5,625
B. Services.....	142,414	138,017	138,017	138,017
C. Capital equipment.....	5,977	7,162	7,162	7,162
Subtotal, Other expenses.....	154,651	150,804	150,804	150,804
IV. Program Support				
A. Policy analysis and system studies.....	2,500	3,219	2,600	2,600
B. Indian Affairs.....	200	---	---	---
C. Consumer Affairs.....	65	67	67	67

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
D. Public Affairs	251	260	260	260
E. Competition	50	50	50	50
F. International Policy Studies	947	1,000	1,000	1,000
G. Office of Minority Economic Impact	3,200	2,501	3,500	3,500
Subtotal, Program support	7,213	7,097	7,477	7,477
Subtotal, administrative operations	325,705	318,638	319,018	319,018
V. Cost of work for others	110,570	115,562	129,030	129,030
VI. Miscellaneous revenues	-233,896	-224,273	-240,725	-240,725
SUBTOTAL, DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION	202,379	209,927	207,323	207,323
A-76 Studies	---	-2,000	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Use of unobligated balances.....	-40,762	-30,113	-44,383	-44,383
TOTAL, DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION.....	161,617	177,814	162,940	162,940
(Operating expenses).....	(155,640)	(170,652)	(155,778)	(155,778)
(Capital equipment).....	(5,977)	(7,162)	(7,162)	(7,162)

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
ALASKA POWER ADMINISTRATION - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE				
I. Power marketing - Alaska Power Administration				
A. Operating expenses	3,191	3,279	3,279	3,279
B. Emergency fund	---	---	---	---
Use of prior year balances	-165	-120	-120	-120
TOTAL ALASKA POWER ADMINISTRATION	3,026	3,159	3,159	3,159
SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE				
I. Power marketing - Southeastern power administration				
A. Operating and maintenance	2,104	2,647	2,647	2,647

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
B. Purchase power and wheeling	25,296	33,620	33,620	33,620
Use of prior year balances	---	---	---	---
TOTAL SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	27,400	36,267	36,267	36,267
I. Continuing fund	---	---	---	---
SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE				
I. Power marketing - Southwestern Power Administration				
A. Operation and maintenance	13,137	14,815	14,815	14,815
B. Purchase power and wheeling	11,188	7,936	7,936	7,936
C. Construction	5,988	5,838	5,838	5,838
Use of prior year balances	-13,665	-13,200	-13,200	-13,200
TOTAL SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	16,648	15,389	15,389	15,389

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION - CONSTRUCTION, REHABILITATION, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE				
I. Power marketing - Western Area Power Administration				
A. Construction and rehabilitation	85,000	94,252	94,252	94,252
B. System operation and maintenance	93,000	90,461	90,461	90,461
C. Purchase power and wheeling	122,000	113,700	88,700	88,700
Unobligated balances	-50,485	---	---	---
Transfer from DOI	-7,003	-2,485	-2,485	-2,485
TOTAL WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION	242,512	295,928	270,928	270,928

Alaska Power Administration

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriations, 1988	$3,159,000
Budget estimate, 1989	3,159,000
House allowance	3,159,000
Committee recommendation	3,159,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

An appropriation of $3,159,000 is recommended by the Committee. This is the same as the budget request and the House allowance.

The Alaska Power Administration is responsible for operation, maintenance, and power marketing of two Federal hydroelectric projects in Alaska. The operating projects are the 30,000 kW Eklutna project near Anchorage and the 47,160 kW Snettisham project near Juneau. Project facilities include dams, reservoirs, powerplants, transmissions system, and necessary maintenance facilities. Power is marketed at wholesale to five Alaskan utilities. The projects represent a current Federal investment of $113,000,000 and a replacement value in excess of $275,000,000.

Bonneville Power Administration Fund

Bonneville Power Administration [BPA] is the Federal electric power marketing agency for the Federal Columbia River Power System [FCRPS], which consists of the hydroelectric generating facilities in the Pacific Northwest of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior (30 projects at present), plus BPA's transmission system of more than 14,600 circuit-miles of high-voltage transmission lines and 386 substations. BPA markets about one-half of the electric power produced in the Northwest and provides about four-fifths of the region's bulk electric power transmission capacity. Also, BPA markets and exchanges electric power interregionally over the Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest Intertie, and in Canada over interconnections with utilities in British Columbia.

Borrowing authority.—A total of $3,750,000,000 has been made available to BPA as permanent borrowing authority. Each year the Committee reviews the budgeted amounts BPA plans to use of this total and reports a recommendation of Bonneville's borrowing requirements.

In addition to the cumulative $2,760,000,000 available to BPA through fiscal year 1988, the Committee recommends an additional increment of $221,200,000 in borrowing authority in fiscal year 1989 for the construction, conservation, capital equipment, and fish and wildlife for a total of $2,980,000,000, including any unused portion from prior years. These recommendations reflect BPA's March 1988 programmatic adjustments and the Committee's restoration of $75,000,000 in borrowing authority for the third a.c. intertie in 1989, and includes authority for model conservation standards.

Third a.c. intertie.—The President's budget submittal to the Congress would deny the Bonneville Power Administration the authority to borrow funds for the financing of the Pacific Northwest portion of the third a.c. intertie. It is estimated that such a denial will delay completion of the line by up to 2 years thereby resulting in a loss of revenues to the Treasury from the sale of energy and capacity. The administration in the fiscal year 1989 budget request also zeroed out the borrowing authority for construction of the third intertie which was provided in BPA's budget submission for fiscal year 1988. The administration did not provide for borrowing authority because a study of potential non-Federal participation in construction of the line was then underway.

It is the Committee's opinion that initiation of Federal construction of the line will not preclude or prejudice non-Federal participation in the intertie. BPA's actions should be conducted accordingly. In addition, prompt construction of the line will provide additional revenues to the Treasury as well as protect the Federal investment in the Federal Columbia River Power System by helping assure payment of the debt on a timely basis. Because it is very likely that any non-Federal participation will necessitate a supplemental environmental impact statement, which would take up to 2 years to complete, the exercise of borrowing authority must be available to the BPA Administrator to allow the Administrator's non-Federal participation process to proceed in parallel with construction so that Federal construction will not be delayed.

Therefore, the Committee recommendation restores $75,000,000 in 1989 borrowing authority to the BPA Administrator. This recommendation reflects some construction schedule slippage. While the Committee recommends restoration of the borrowing authority to the BPA, its actions should not be taken as a decision favoring the construction of the third a.c. intertie with or without non-Federal funds. The Committee's actions merely reflects the belief that Bonneville should have at its disposal, the financial tools necessary to resolve these related matters in a manner which is in the best interest of the Federal Government and the region.

This action will help assure that the Federal Government can expeditiously initiate and complete the construction of this project as authorized by Public Law 98–360. While the Committee is very concerned that regulatory delays in California may further delay the upgrade of this inter-regional intertie, the Committee wants to assure that the Federal Government will facilitate expeditious construction rather than delay construction.

Repayment.—The Committee is aware of the difficult continuing efforts of the BPA to improve its fiscal condition. In fiscal year 1987, BPA paid the U.S. Treasury approximately $630,000,000 including $151,400,000 for amortization. At the end of fiscal year 1987 BPA was current in its payments of interest and amortization to the Treasury.

The Committee is pleased with BPA's actions to control costs and implement innovative market arrangements that will aid in assuring the fiscal soundness of BPA.

Assured borrowing access.—In 1974, the Congress enacted the Federal Columbia Transmission System Act, Public Law 93–454, with the explicit purpose of providing a financing mechanism whereby the Bonneville Power Administration would have the flexibility to borrow money from an established Treasury fund in order to complete capital construction projects on a timely and reliable basis. At that time, the Office of Management and Budget and users of the Bonneville system agreed that in exchange for such self-financing flexibility, regional interests would assume a higher rate of interest on such borrowing authority.

The Committee strongly believes that withholding borrowing authority for Bonneville Power Administration activities in fiscal year 1989 violates the intent of the Columbia Transmission System Act which clearly established the primacy of Bonneville's need for flexibility in delivering energy resources and capability on a timely basis. Moreover, the Committee believes that the removal of fiscal year 1988 current operating year borrowing authority, subsequent to congressional approval, was a further violation of the 1974 act. However, the Committee is pleased to learn that progress is being made in discussions between OMB and BPA to resolve these matters and reaffirm the self-financing flexibility envisioned by the legislation.

Therefore, pursuant to section 11(b) of Public Law 93–454, the Committee recommends bill language to affirm that $21,000,000 of the $24,100,000 in fiscal year 1988 borrowing authority, continues to be available to the Administrator. If the Administrator determines that construction slippage on the project will cause an imbalance in the BPA construction work plan, the Administrator can, upon notification to the Congress, redirect that fiscal year 1988 borrowing as he deems necessary to other needed construction work in order to optimize the level of construction effort.

Southeastern Power Administration

Operation and Maintenance

Appropriations, 1988	$27,400,000
Budget estimate, 1989	36,267,000
House allowance	36,267,000
Committee recommendation	36,267,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

The Committee recommendation concurs with the budget request and House action which appropriates $36,267,000 for the Southeastern Power Administration.

The Southeastern Power Administration [SEA] markets hydroelectric power produced at Federal projects located in 10 Southeastern States in accordance with policy directives contained in section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944. The States include Virginia, West Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Florida, and Mississippi. There are 22 projects now in operation with an installed capacity of 3,092,375 kilowatts.

Southeastern does not own or operate any transmission facilities and carries out its marketing program by utilizing the existing transmission systems of the power utilities in the area. This is accomplished through wheeling arrangements between Southeastern and each of the area utilities with transmission lines connected to the projects. The utility agrees to deliver specified amounts of Federal power to customers of the Government, and Southeastern agrees to compensate the utility of the wheeling service performed.

The recommended appropriation does not provide any funds for studies of the divestiture of SEA. The Committee reiterates its position that this proposed study and the actual divestiture of Southeastern require the enactment of appropriate authorizing legislation. To date, such legislation has not been enacted.

Southwestern Power Administration

Operation and Maintenance

Appropriations, 1988	$16,648,000
Budget estimate, 1989	15,389,000
House allowance	15,389,000
Committee recommendation	15,389,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

The Committee recommends concurrence with the House allowance of $15,389,000. This is the same as the budget request.

The Southwestern Power Administration [SWPA] is the marketing agent for the disposal of power and energy generated at U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' hydroelectric plants in the six-State area of Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Missouri, Arkansas, and Louisiana. It is headquartered in Tulsa, OK, with an operation control center located in Springfield, MO, and maintenance crews and support warehouses located in Muskeg and Ada, OK; Jonesboro, AR; and Springfield, MO.

The SWPA provides transmission lines, substations, switching stations, and communication facilities for integration and optimal distribution of electricity from hydroelectric projects for transmission and sale of power to geographically dispersed customers.

The SWPA schedules and controls the generation of power from 23 hydroelectric projects. In addition, the SWPA operates and maintains 1,355 miles of transmission lines consisting of 161 kilovolts, 138 volts, and 69 kilovolts wood pole and steel construction. It performs maintenance on 35 radio and microwave stations, 34 switching stations and substations, with a total installed capacity of 2,150,400 kilowatts.

As of the end of fiscal year 1987, the cumulative Federal investment in SWPA projects totals $882,770,000. Of this, $143,588,000 has been repaid to the Treasury.

The recommendation for fiscal year 1989 continues to reflect the availability for use of large amounts of unobligated appropriations from prior years.

WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION

CONSTRUCTION, REHABILITATION, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriations, 1988	$242,512,000
Budget estimate, 1989	295,928,000
House allowance	270,928,000
Committee recommendation	270,928,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−25,000,000
House allowance	

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $270,928,000, which is the same as the House allowance and $25,000,000 below the budget request.

The Construction, Rehabilitation, Operation and Maintenance Program of the Western Area Power Administration [WAPA], excluding the Colorado River storage project and Fort Peck project, involves marketing federally generated hydroelectric power within a 15-State area in the West.

Western is responsible for the operation and maintenance of about 16,000 miles of transmission lines and over 242 substations. Electric power marketed by Western is generated by the Bureau of Reclamation, the Corps of Engineers, and the International Boundary and Water Commission in Texas, all of which operate some 52 hydropower generating plants in Western's service area with a current installed generating capacity of 8,865,000 kilowatts.

As of the end of fiscal year 1986, the cumulative Federal investment in WAPA projects totals approximately $5,000,000,000. Of this, $2,100,000,000 has been repaid to the Treasury. In fiscal year 1987, $204,000,000 was applied to repayment of the Federal investment.

The recommendation provides for the level of activity requested by WAPA in fiscal year 1989, but reflects an anticipated $25,000,000 savings over previous estimates, resulting in an appropriation of $270,928,000.

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1988	$100,000,000
Budget estimate, 1989	106,760,000
House allowance	108,760,000
Committee recommendation	108,760,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+2,000,000
House allowance	

REVENUES APPLIED

Appropriations, 1988	−$100,000,000
Budget estimate, 1989	−106,760,000
House allowance	−108,760,000
Committee recommendation	−108,760,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−2,000,000
House allowance	

NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 1988	
Budget estimate, 1989	
House allowance	
Committee recommendation	
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

The Committee concurs with the House action in recommending $108,760,000 for salaries and expenses of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

Section 204 and title IV of Public Law 95–91, the Department of Energy Organization Act, established within the Department of Energy Organization Act, established within the Department of Energy the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission [FERC] to carry out functions transferred from the Federal Power Commission for hydroelectric, electric utility, and natural gas regulation and from the Interstate Commerce Commission for oil pipeline regulation.

The act sets out the clear intent of Congress that the Commission be independent from supervision or direction from any other officer of the Department, but provides that the Secretary shall provide to the Commission such support and facilities as the Commission determines it needs to carry out its functions. This support includes services for personnel, accounting, facilities support, computer operations, procurement, and other similar services funded elsewhere in the departmental request.

The Committee recommendation includes an increase of $2,000,000 for the specific purpose of a thorough and timely environmental review of the proposed natural gas pipeline projects being considered under the Commission's Northeast U.S. pipeline projects open season, Docket No. CP87–451–004, et al. The Committee expects the Commission to comply with all applicable environmental laws and regulations in it's environmental review of all projects to supply natural gas to the Northeast. Such funds, and any additional funds that may be necessary to complete this review, must be used to comply with the Commission's legal requirements and also to develop a comprehensive record of the environmental impacts of each natural gas proposal. This appropriation shall remain available until expended for activities in this effort.

While the Committee is very reluctant to involve itself in Commission regulatory matters, the Committee is extremely concerned about the Commission's decision on April 6, 1988, to disapprove the Bonneville

Power Administration's proposed long-term surplus firm power rate (the SL rate). This order reverses 6 years of established Commission decisions regarding long-term energy sales, contradicts decisions of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals and the U.S. Supreme Court, and has already jeopardized conclusion of a long-term sale by BPA to a California utility. Because of the historic precedent of the decision, the Commission is strongly urged to reexamine this order and give careful consideration to the express words of the Northwest Power Act and the clear legislative history underlying it.

GEOTHERMAL RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT FUND

Appropriations, 1988	$72,000
Budget estimate, 1989	75,000
House allowance	75,000
Committee recommendation	75,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $75,000. This is the same as the budget request and the House allowance.

The Geothermal Loan Guarantee and Interest Assistance Program is authorized under the Geothermal Energy Research, Development, and Demonstration Act of 1974 (Public Law 93–410), as amended by the Department of Energy Act of 1978—Civilian Applications (Public Law 95–238).

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

The Committee recommends a new general provision, section 305, which provides that funds received as restitution for certain petroleum pricing violations are, when appropriated or expended by a State, deemed consistent with the restitutionary purposes for which they were received.

Currently over $2,000,000,000 is available, without appropriation, for use by States in supplementing certain Federal energy programs, including low-income energy assistance, weatherization, and for various State initiated conservation programs. The source for these funds is a host of enforcement actions which have either been successfully litigated or settled by DOE, principally the *Exxon* and *Stripper Well* cases. While these funds are made available to the State without appropriation, each expenditure for each project must receive prior approval from DOE. For supplement for the Federal programs, the approval is routine. However, an inordinate amount of delay results from the necessity of DOE approval of State initiated projects. The amendment simply provides that States with unemployment in excess of 10 percent need not get prior approval from DOE. In this way, States with high unemployment may more quickly initiate State energy conservation programs. The amendment does nothing to alter the amount of funds available to any State under existing law.

TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Appropriations, 1988	$107,000,000
Budget estimate, 1989	
House allowance	107,000,000
Committee recommendation	110,700,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+110,700,000
House allowance	+3,700,000

The Committee recommends $110,700,000 for the Appalachian Regional Commission [ARC] activities, including salaries and expenses. This is the same as the appropriation for the current fiscal year.

In response to expressed interest, the Committee has been informed of actions taken by ARC to reassess their contracting, auditing, and management procedures and regulations. The Committee supports and encourages those initial efforts to undertake a critical, independent review of ARC internal operations. The stewardship of Federal resources is an important responsibility even to the uniquely structured Appalachian Regional Commission, and the Committee expects to be kept informed as to the recommendations and subsequent actions taken by ARC in response to the reviews currently underway.

The Committee understands that a large industrial corporation has committed to construct a major $400,000,000 plant in Lowndes County, MS, under the condition that the access roads to the site be upgraded to accommodoate the increased heavy truck traffic, and that State and local agencies are providing all but $3,700,000 of the cost necessary to upgrade the roads. In light of this, the Committee has provided an additional $3,700,000 to this appropriation to upgrade the extension of Highway 388 from Cliftonville to the Alabama State line; the Columbus-Macon Road from Highway 388 to the Noxubee/Lowndes County line; and Columbus-Macon Road from the Noxubee/Lowndes County line to Carson Road.

Within the amount recommended for Appalachian regional development programs, the Committee has provided $5,000,000 for Corridor H in West Virginia.

Delaware River Basin Commission

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1988	$203,000
Budget estimate, 1989	205,000
House allowance	205,000
Committee recommendation	205,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

An appropriation of $205,000 is recommended for the Delaware River Basin Commission salaries and expenses. This is the same as the House allowance and the budget request.

The Delaware River Basin Commission was created by compact (under Public Law 87–328) among the States of Delaware, New Jersey, New York, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and the Federal Government. The compact enables the Commission to participate jointly in the development of water and related resources of the region drained by the Delaware River and its tributaries.

CONTRIBUTION TO DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

Appropriations, 1988	$263,000
Budget estimate, 1989	263,000
House allowance	263,000
Committee recommendation	263,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

The Committee concurs with the House and recommendation of $263,000 for fiscal year 1989.

This appropriation provides the Federal share of the annual expenses of the Commission. The compact provides that the amount required to balance the Commission's current expense budget shall be apportioned equitably among the signatory parties by unanimous vote of the Commission. The Commission's expense budget for 1989 is $2,294,000.

Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin

CONTRIBUTION TO INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE POTOMAC RIVER BASIN

Appropriations, 1988	$379,000
Budget estimate, 1989	79,000
House allowance	79,000
Committee recommendation	379,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+ 300,000
House allowance	+ 300,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $379,000 for the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin. The increase over the budget allows the Commission to continue to work closely with the Corps of Engineers and the States on issues of mutual interest, with flood control receiving primary emphasis.

The Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin was created in 1940 by compact among the States in the basin of Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the District of Columbia, and the Federal Government. The Commission has the responsibility for basinwide water quality, planning, program coordination, and assistance.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 1988	$392,800,000
Budget estimate, 1989	450,000,000
House allowance	420,000,000
Committee recommendation	430,000,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−20,000,000
House allowance	+10,000,000

REVENUES

Appropriations, 1988	$196,400,000
Budget estimate, 1989	247,500,000
House allowance	189,000,000
Committee recommendation	193,500,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+54,000,000
House allowance	−4,500,000

NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 1988	$196,400,000
Budget estimate, 1989	202,500,000
House allowance	231,000,000
Committee recommendation	236,500,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+34,000,000
House allowance	+5,500,000

An appropriation of $430,000,000 is recommended for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission which is $20,000,000 below the budget request for fiscal year 1989.

The President's fiscal year 1989 budget request proposes to increase the amount of fees and other collections to be received by the Commission to 55 percent of its proposed budget and deposit these revenues in the Treasury. The Committee recommendation utilizes appropriation language to reflect the application of these revenues to offset the appropriation. Authorizing legislation to permit the Commission to collect 45 percent of its appropriations has been enacted, and the Committee recommendation is consistent with this proposal.

In restoring a portion of the House reduction, the Committee recognizes the critical importance of the nuclear regulatory program, including the need to assure the protection of the public health and safety. The Committee is deeply concerned about the Commission's safety

research activities which have been responsible for providing a sound, technical basis for regulatory decisions.

Susquehanna River Basin Commission

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1988	$197,000
Budget estimate, 1989	192,000
House allowance	192,000
Committee recommendation	192,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

The Committee recommends $192,000 for salaries and expenses of the Susquehanna River Basin, which is the same as the House allowance and the budget request.

The Susquehanna River Basin Commission was created by compact (Public Law 91-575) among the States of Maryland and New York, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and the Federal Government to enable them to participate jointly in the development of water and related resources of the region drained by the Susquehanna River Basin and its tributaries.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

Appropriations, 1988	$249,000
Budget estimate, 1989	262,000
House allowance	262,000
Committee recommendation	262,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

An amount of $262,000 is recommended by the Committee, which is the same as the budget request and the House allowance.

This appropriation provides for the Federal share of the annual expenses of the Commission. The compact provides that the amount required to balance the Commission's current expenses budget shall be apportioned equitably among the signatory parties by unanimous vote of the Commission.

The 1989 current expense budget of the Commission is $1,648,000.

Tennessee Valley Authority

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY FUND

Appropriations, 1988	$103,000,000
Budget estimate, 1989	75,973,000
House allowance	103,000,000
Committee recommendation	103,000,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+27,027,000
House allowance	

The Committee recommend an appropriation of $103,000,000 for the Tennessee Valley Authority [TVA]. This the same level as provided for the current fiscal year.

Water Quality Improvement Program.—The Committee has included $8,200,000 for water quality improvement programs to increase TVA's efforts in this critical work, especially at Kentucky and Boone Reservoirs. The problems outlined in the Committee report last year continue, and the drought in the Tennessee Valley, now in its fourth year, has had a severe cumulative impact on water quantity and quality.

While continuing to strongly support TVA's efforts, the Committee wishes to stress that TVA cannot solve this problem alone and must have increased support and help from the States, and local community officials and leaders.

Hixson, TN, greenway project.—Within available funds, the Tennessee Valley Authority is directed to use $200,000 for design and construction on the greenway project along North Chickamauga Creek near Hixson, TN.

The following table shows the allocation of the funds recommended for activities under this heading.

RECOMMENDED APPROPRIATION

[In thousands of dollars]

	1988 program	1989 budget request	1989 recommendation
CAPITAL INVESTMENT			
Columbia Dam and Reservoir	185	.....	245
Dam safety modifications	4,903	4,400	4,400
Additions and improvements	2,047	1,853	1,862
Land and forest resources	15	.....	25
Land Between the Lakes facilities	91	400	98
Fertilizer test facilities	4,142	3,600	4,901
General facilities	2,083	2,048	1,960
Total, capital investment	13,466	12,301	13,491
OPERATING EXPENSES			
Natural resources:			
Water resources	7,229	2,250	7,057
Reservoir system operations	22,757	21,610	22,543
Land and forest resources	3,679	550	3,626
Resource management and development support	4,353	3,160	4,705
Land Between the Lakes	6,144	6,200	6,371
Total, natural resources	44,162	33,770	44,302
Economic resources	14,085	250	12,202
Agricultural resources development	3,931	3,781	3,989
National fertilizer development:			
Fertilizer research	16,315	13,050	15,132
Technology introduction	10,320	9,000	10,680
Hardwood research and testing	2,846	3,031	2,787
Total, national fertilizer development	29,481	25,081	28,599

RECOMMENDED APPROPRIATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	1988 program	1989 budget request	1989 recommendation
OPERATING EXPENSES—Continued			
General services	1,234	790	417
Total, operating expenses	92,893	63,672	89,509
Total, appropriations	106,359	75,973	103,000
FINANCING			
Appropriations	103,000	75,973	103,000
Unobligated balance brought forward	3,359		
Total, financing	106,359	75,973	103,000

GENERAL PROVISION

The Committee has stricken from the bill the provision in the House bill relating to the expenditure of funds in any workplace not free of any illegal drugs or controlled substances. The Committee understands that the Senate will consider legislation dealing with this issue in the near future.

COMPLIANCE WITH PARAGRAPH 7, RULE XVI, OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Paragraph 7 of rule XVI requires that Committee reports on general appropriations bills identify each Committee amendment to the House bill "which proposes an item of appropriation which is not made to carry out the provisions of an existing law, a treaty stipulation, or an act or resolution previously passed by the Senate during that session."

The following items of appropriations recommended by the Committee, not made to carry out the provisions of existing law or an act passed by the Senate in this session, are brought to the attention of the Senate in accordance with rule XVI, paragraph 7.

On page 35, under Appalachian Regional Commission, $110,700,000 is recommended for regional development and highways programs for which there is no authorization.

BUDGETARY IMPACT OF BILL

PREPARED BY THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE PURSUANT TO SEC. 308(a), PUBLIC LAW 93-344, AS AMENDED

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority		Outlays	
	Committee allocation	Amount in bill	Committee allocation	Amount in bill
Comparison of amounts in the bill with the Committee allocation to its subcommittees of amounts in the First Concurrent Resolution for 1989: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development	16.85	16,681	16.70	[1] 16,478
Projections of outlays associated with budget authority recommended in the bill:				
1989				[2] 10,259
1990				5,024
1991				1,339
1992				33
1993 and future year				25
Financial assistance to State and local governments for 1989 in the bill		106		5
	Direct loans		Loan guarantees	
Credit authority estimates, fiscal year 1989	30	25		

[1] Includes outlays from prior-year budget authority.
[2] Excludes outlays from prior-year budget authority.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1988 AND THE BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR FISCAL YEAR 1989

[Becomes available automatically under earlier, or "permanent" law without further, or annual, action by the Congress. Thus, these amounts are not included in the accompanying bill.]

Agency and item	New budget (obligational) authority, 1988	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, 1989	Increase or decrease
PERMANENT NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY			
FEDERAL FUNDS			
Corps of Engineers—Civil: Permanent appropriations	$9,000,000	$9,000,000	
Department of the Interior: Bureau of Reclamation: Miscellaneous appropriations	287,000	282,000	- $5,000
Department of Energy:			
Colorado River dam fund, Boulder Canyon project	55,680,000	40,832,000	- 14,848,000
Payments to States under Federal Power Act	1,839,000	1,909,000	+ 70,000
Continuing fund, Western Area Power Administration	24,000		- 24,000
Bonneville Power Administration Fund (authority to borrow)	165,000,000	146,200,000	- 18,800,000
Tennessee Valley Authority Fund (authority to borrow)	1,268,900,000	858,100,000	- 410,800,000
Total, permanent new budget (obligational) authority, Federal funds	1,500,730,000	1,056,323,000	- 444,407,000
TRUST FUNDS			
Corps of Engineers—Civil: Rivers and harbors contributed funds	233,000,000	241,000,000	+ 8,000,000
Department of the Interior: Reclamation trust funds	51,800,000	67,101,000	+ 15,301,000
Department of Energy: Advances for cooperative work	138,200,000	144,867,000	+ 6,667,000
Appalachian Regional Commission: Miscellaneous trust funds	3,700,000	1,247,000	- 2,453,000
Total, permanent new budget (obligational) authority, trust funds	426,700,000	454,215,000	+ 27,515,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1988 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1989

[Amounts in dollars]

Item	1988 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)		
					1988 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL							
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY							
Corps of Engineers - Civil							
General investigations	138,767,000	129,271,000	142,405,000	140,411,000	+1,644,000	+11,140,000	-1,994,000
Construction, general	1,200,175,000	1,227,570,000	1,193,687,000	1,184,735,000	-15,440,000	-42,835,000	-8,952,000
Flood control and coastal emergencies	20,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	20,000,000	---	-5,000,000	-5,000,000
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee	317,704,000	334,297,000	337,980,000	337,980,000	+20,276,000	+3,683,000	---
Operation and maintenance, general 1/	1,400,000,000	1,372,894,000	1,378,833,000	1,362,894,000	-37,106,000	-10,000,000	-15,939,000
General Regulatory Functions	55,262,000	60,427,000	60,427,000	60,427,000	+5,165,000	---	---
Revolving Fund	---	35,174,000	---	10,000,000	+10,000,000	-25,174,000	+10,000,000
General expenses	115,200,000	123,465,000	120,000,000	120,000,000	+4,800,000	-3,465,000	---
Total, title I, Department of Defense - Civil: New budget (obligational) authority	3,247,108,000	3,308,098,000	3,258,332,000	3,236,447,000	-10,661,000	-71,651,000	-21,885,000

1/ Reflects transfer of $55,262,000 to 'General Regulatory Functions' in FY88 Enacted.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1988 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1989—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Item	1988 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)		
					1988 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR							
Bureau of Reclamation							
General investigations	16,590,000	12,286,000	13,761,000	14,250,000	-2,340,000	+1,964,000	+489,000
Construction program	703,716,000	698,236,000	709,332,000	712,905,000	+9,189,000	+14,669,000	+3,573,000
Operation and maintenance	151,000,000	183,231,000	192,331,000	183,231,000	+32,231,000	---	-9,100,000
Loan program	32,309,000	19,022,000	29,022,000	26,022,000	-6,287,000	+7,000,000	-3,000,000
(Limitation on direct loans)	(31,972,000)	(17,766,000)	(27,766,000)	(24,766,000)	(-7,206,000)	(+7,000,000)	(-3,000,000)
General administrative expenses	51,690,000	50,313,000	48,313,000	48,313,000	-3,377,000	-2,000,000	---
Emergency fund	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	---	---	---
Working Capital fund	---	7,900,000	---	7,900,000	+7,900,000	---	+7,900,000
Colorado River Dam fund (by transfer, permanent authority)	(-7,003,000)	(-2,485,000)	(-2,485,000)	(-2,485,000)	(+4,518,000)	---	---
Total, Bureau of Reclamation	956,305,000	971,988,000	993,759,000	993,621,000	+37,316,000	+21,633,000	-138,000
Total, title II, Department of the Interior:							
New budget (obligational) authority	956,305,000	971,988,000	993,759,000	993,621,000	+37,316,000	+21,633,000	-138,000
(Limitation on direct loans)	(31,972,000)	(17,766,000)	(27,766,000)	(24,766,000)	(-7,206,000)	(+7,000,000)	(-3,000,000)
(By transfer)	(-7,003,000)	(-2,485,000)	(-2,485,000)	(-2,485,000)	(+4,518,000)	---	---

TITLE III - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Energy Supply, Research and Development Activities:							
Operating Expenses	1,646,724,000	1,732,118,000	1,811,190,000	1,895,594,000	+248,870,000	+163,476,000	+84,404,000
Plant and Capital Equipment	341,633,000	237,642,000	261,432,000	312,832,000	-28,801,000	+75,190,000	+51,400,000
(By transfer)	(104,000,000)	---	---	---	(-104,000,000)	---	---
Subtotal	1,988,357,000	1,969,760,000	2,072,622,000	2,208,426,000	+220,069,000	+238,666,000	+135,804,000
Isotope production and distribution fund	---	16,243,000	---	---	---	-16,243,000	---
Uranium Supply and Enrichment Activities:							
Operating Expenses	916,000,000	1,103,300,000	1,060,680,000	1,106,600,000	+190,600,000	+3,300,000	+45,920,000
Plant and Capital Equipment	34,000,000	80,700,000	72,400,000	75,000,000	+41,000,000	-5,700,000	+2,600,000
Total	950,000,000	1,184,000,000	1,133,080,000	1,181,600,000	+231,600,000	-2,400,000	+48,520,000
Gross revenues	(-1,301,000,000)	(-1,276,000,000)	(-1,276,000,000)	(-1,276,000,000)	(+25,000,000)	---	---
General Science and Research Activities:							
Operating Expenses	627,423,000	266,254,000	737,916,000	716,916,000	+89,493,000	+450,662,000	-21,000,000
Plant and Capital Equipment	177,075,000	98,732,000	191,200,000	217,700,000	+40,625,000	+118,968,000	+26,500,000
Subtotal	804,498,000	364,986,000	929,116,000	934,616,000	+130,118,000	+569,630,000	+5,500,000
Basic research user facilities	---	972,613,000	---	---	---	-972,613,000	---
Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund	360,000,000	448,832,000	369,832,000	369,832,000	+9,832,000	-79,000,000	---
Atomic Energy Defense Activites:							
Operating Expenses	6,253,465,000	6,632,025,000	6,627,025,000	6,657,025,000	+403,560,000	+25,000,000	+30,000,000
Plant and Capital Equipment	1,495,899,000	1,467,975,000	1,472,975,000	1,435,075,000	-60,824,000	-32,900,000	-37,900,000
Subtotal	7,749,364,000	8,100,000,000	8,100,000,000	8,092,100,000	+342,736,000	-7,900,000	-7,900,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1988 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1989—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Item	1988 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)		
					1988 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Departmental Administration:							
Operating Expenses	389,536,000	394,925,000	396,503,000	396,503,000	+6,967,000	+1,578,000	---
Plant and Capital Equipment	5,977,000	7,162,000	7,162,000	7,162,000	+1,185,000	---	---
Subtotal	395,513,000	402,087,000	403,665,000	403,665,000	+8,152,000	+1,578,000	---
Miscellaneous revenues	-233,896,000	-224,273,000	-240,725,000	-240,725,000	-6,829,000	-16,452,000	---
Net appropriation	161,617,000	177,814,000	162,940,000	162,940,000	+1,323,000	-14,874,000	---
Power Marketing Administrations							
Operation and maintenance, Alaska Power Administration	3,026,000	3,159,000	3,159,000	3,159,000	+133,000	---	---
Operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration	27,400,000	36,267,000	36,267,000	36,267,000	+8,867,000	---	---
Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration	16,648,000	15,389,000	15,389,000	15,389,000	-1,259,000	---	---
Construction, rehabilitation, operation and maintenance, Western Area Power Administration	242,512,000	295,928,000	270,928,000	270,928,000	+28,416,000	-25,000,000	---
(By transfer, permanent authority)	(7,003,000)	(2,485,000)	(2,485,000)	(2,485,000)	(-4,518,000)	---	---
Subtotal	289,586,000	350,743,000	325,743,000	325,743,000	+36,157,000	-25,000,000	---

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission							
Salaries and expenses	100,000,000	106,760,000	108,760,000	108,760,000	+8,760,000	+2,000,000	---
Revenues Applied	-100,000,000	-106,760,000	-108,760,000	-108,760,000	-8,760,000	-2,000,000	---
Subtotal	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Geothermal Resources Development Fund							
Geothermal loan guarantee and interest assistance program	72,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	+3,000	---	---
Total, title III, Department of Energy:							
New budget (obligational) authority	12,303,494,000	13,585,066,000	13,093,408,000	13,275,332,000	+971,838,000	-309,734,000	+181,924,000
Operating Expenses	(10,248,910,000)	(11,692,855,000)	(11,088,239,000)	(11,227,563,000)	(+978,653,000)	(-465,292,000)	(+139,324,000)
Plant and Capital Equipment	(2,054,584,000)	(1,892,211,000)	(2,005,169,000)	(2,047,769,000)	(-6,815,000)	(+155,558,000)	(+42,600,000)
(By transfer)	(111,003,000)	(2,485,000)	(2,485,000)	(2,485,000)	(-108,518,000)	---	---
TITLE IV - INDEPENDENT AGENCIES							
Appalachian Regional Commission:							
Appalachian regional development programs	107,000,000	---	107,000,000	110,700,000	+3,700,000	+110,700,000	+3,700,000
Delaware River Basin Commission:							
Salaries and expenses	203,000	205,000	205,000	205,000	+2,000	---	---
Contribution to Delaware River Basin Commission	263,000	263,000	263,000	263,000	---	---	---
Total, Delaware River Basin Commission	466,000	468,000	468,000	468,000	+2,000	---	---
Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin:							
Contribution to Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin	379,000	---	79,000	379,000	---	+379,000	+300,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1988 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1989—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Item	1988 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)		
					1988 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Nuclear Regulatory Commission:							
Salaries and expenses	392,800,000	450,000,000	420,000,000	430,000,000	+37,200,000	-20,000,000	+10,000,000
Revenues	-196,400,000	-247,500,000	-189,000,000	-193,500,000	+2,900,000	+54,000,000	-4,500,000
Total, Nuclear Regulatory Commission	196,400,000	202,500,000	231,000,000	236,500,000	+40,100,000	+34,000,000	+5,500,000
Susquehanna River Basin Commission:							
Salaries and expenses	197,000	192,000	192,000	192,000	-5,000	---	---
Contribution to Susquehanna River Basin Commission	249,000	262,000	262,000	262,000	+13,000	---	---
Total, Susquehanna River Basin Commission	446,000	454,000	454,000	454,000	+8,000	---	---
Tennessee Valley Authority:							
Tennessee Valley Authority Fund	103,000,000	75,973,000	103,000,000	103,000,000	---	+27,027,000	---
Total, title IV, Independent agencies:							
New budget (obligational) authority	407,691,000	279,395,000	442,001,000	451,501,000	+43,810,000	+172,106,000	+9,500,000
Grand total, all titles:							
New budget (obligational) authority	16,914,598,000	18,144,547,000	17,787,500,000	17,956,901,000	+1,042,303,000	-187,646,000	+169,401,000
(Limitation on direct loans)	(31,972,000)	(17,766,000)	(27,766,000)	(24,766,000)	(-7,206,000)	(+7,000,000)	(-3,000,000)
(By transfer)	(104,000,000)	---	---	---	(-104,000,000)	---	---